DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 659 HE 010 939

TITLE Education for Justice. Occasional Papers on Catholic Higher Education. Volume IV, Number 2, Winter 1978.

INSTITUTION Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 78

NOTE 39p.; Parts may be marginally legible due to small print

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Catholic Schools; *Church Related Colleges; *Church Role; *College Role; Educational Objectives; Higher Education; International Education; *Justice; Moral Issues; Peace; Pilot Projects; Program Descriptions; *Religious Education; *Religious Organizations; Social Problems; Theological Education

IDENTIFIERS *Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities

ABSTRACT

This report contains a proposal of a task force of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU) for the development of an ACCU program on education for justice. It is believed that the Catholic community must be educated in the tradition of Catholic social thought, and a learning environment must be created that reflects a commitment to justice and an openness on the part of Catholics to change personal attitudes and behavior. After a foreward on education and justice by Alice Gallin, the following four perspectives are presented: "Education for Social Justice--A Christian Perspective," by William J. Byron; "Justice and Peace: The Place and the Potential of Colleges and Universities," by J. Bryan Hehir; "Education in a Global Perspective," by Lawrence T. Murphy; and "Justice--What Is It All About?" by David Burell. Seven institutions were chosen as pilot schools to implement the proposal, and two of the pilot programs are described. Ray Jackson and Dan Regan describe the program at Villanova University and Ken Jamieson describes the program at the University of Notre Dame. Short descriptions are also provided of each of the seven pilot schools. Descriptions of programs at other schools are as follows: Joseph Fahey discusses the model at Manhattan College; Suzanne DeBenedittis discusses the Loyola-Marymount University program; Don Post describes the global studies program at Saint Edward's University; and Joseph Fahey describes the M.A. program in religious studies at Sacred Heart University. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165659

EDUCATION FOR JUSTICE

OCCASIONAL PAPERS On Catholic Higher Education

FOREWORD

Education for Justice: Small Beginnings; High Hopes. . . . . *Alice Gallin, O.S.U.* 1

REFLECTIONS ON EDUCATION FOR JUSTICE

Education for Social Justice — A Christian Perspective. . . . . *William J. Byron, S.J.* 3

Justice and Peace: The Place and the Potential of Colleges and Universities . . . . . *J. Bryan Hehir* 7

Education in a Global Perspective. . . . . *Lawrence T. Murphy, M.M.* 10

Justice — What is it All About? . . . . . *David Burell, C.S.C.* 12

TWO PILOT PROGRAMS

Villanova University . . . . . *Ray Jackson, O.S.A. and Dan Regan* 18

University of Notre Dame. . . . . *Ken Jamieson* 21

NOTES ON OTHER MODELS

Manhattan College . . . . . *Joseph Fahey* 23

Loyola-Marymount University. . . . . *Suzanne DeBenedittis* 24

FACE TO THE FUTURE

Saint Edward's University . . . . . *Don Post* 27

Sacred Heart University. . . . . *Joseph Fahey* 30

APPENDICES

Appendix A—Proposal Concerning Education for Justice, ACCU. 32

Appendix B—Pilot Program Institutions with Relevant Data 33

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS"

Volume IV, Number 2
Winter 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ASSOCIATION OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

HE010939

Catholic Higher Education as a Public Trust

ACCU Annual Meeting

Capital Hilton Hotel
Washington, D.C.

Sunday, February 4-Monday, February 5, 1979

DES Award Lecturer:

The Honorable John F. Gilligan
Administrator of Agency for International Development
"Catholic Higher Education as a Public Trust"

FOREWORD

Education for Justice: Small Beginnings — High Hopes

In May of 1978 the Bishops of the United States issued a "Plan of Action for the Catholic Community in the United States." It is entitled *To Do the Work of Justice.* In the introduction to the plan they invited the entire Catholic community to cooperate in implementing the national overall attack on the injustices in our contemporary world, stating:

> *We do so in the firm conviction that our growth as the community of God's people and our ministry of service to the world are inseparable dimensions of our common Christian commitment. We must, and we will, continue to grow in love and care for one another even as we enter more actively into the pursuit of justice and peace.*

In seeking to engage the Catholic community in this work for justice, the top priority is "Education for Justice." If any of the other goals are to be reached, the Bishops point out, the entire Catholic community must be educated:

> *The education must cut across generational lines, institutional structures and various educational agencies. It requires teaching and learning the tradition of Catholic social thought, the creation of an environment for learning that reflects a commitment to justice and an openness on the part of all Catholics to change personal attitudes and behavior.*

The appearance of this document found the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities already busy about the task of promoting Education for Justice. A Task Force had been set up in the summer of 1975 to study and make recommendations to the membership concerning ways of responding to the increasingly urgent calls from the church to be sensitive to the "Signs of the Times" if we intended to identify with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. By January of 1977, influenced to a degree by the Bicentennial program sponsored by the Bishops which culminated in the Call-to-Action Conference held in Detroit in October of 1976, the Task Force was ready to present its proposal to the Board of Directors of ACCU. Consequent upon its approval, the full membership at its Annual Meeting affirmed the approach suggested by the Task Force. The text of that proposal has been the framework for the development of an ACCU program on Education for Justice, and because the rationale expressed in it is vital to an understanding of our goal, it is printed in this issue of *Occasional Papers* as Appendix A.

Following the Annual Meeting of '77, seven institutions were selected from approximately twenty volunteers to be "model" or "pilot" schools. The staff began to implement the proposal by on-site visits to these institutions, encouraging the setting up of a central committee on the campuses to coordinate the efforts of those faculty, students, and administrators interested in promoting the program. Each campus was to go through a process of identifying the justice issues of most concern to them, trying to discover ways of addressing these issues within the limits of their own resources, both personal and financial. No new curricula were demanded; no special organizational structure was suggested; each college or university was free to develop its own program. The seven pilot schools were chosen in such a way that large and small institutions were represented; single sex and coed — urban and rural — north, south, east and west. They are: Iona College (NY), Aquinas College (MI), Wheeling College (WVA), University of Notre Dame (IN), Villanova (PA), St. Mary-of-the-Woods (IN), Holy Names (CA). A brief description of each institution is given as Appendix B.

As the programs have moved along, we have begun to understand more clearly that it is crucial for our Catholic colleges and universities to discover their unique way of contributing to the effort to mediate justice and peace to a world of war and injustices. What task can they do that other institutions can not? In what way are the resources and capabilities of the higher education community, i.e. those that are *specifically* and *uniquely theirs,* to be made available to this common purpose? Can these particular institutions, within and because of their own primary purpose of higher education, make a significant difference in

the over-all struggle of the Catholic community to respond to the signs of the times? As the reports come back from the pilot institutions, it is evident that three points are fundamental: 1) That the program should have a component of religious reflection built into the work of the nuclear or coordinating committee; 2) That linkages should be established repeatedly between national and world justice issues and local or campus concerns — for example, a focus on World Hunger should be seen in relation to cafeteria wastefulness or individual life style in the USA; 3) That each action step should be seen in relation to the basic mission of a college or university — e.g. the *critical, intelligent understanding* of the *issues* involved before suggesting a boycott of all banks doing business in South Africa. For if it is in the transformation of the institutions of our society that the long-range solutions to current injustices will be found, then in that process the academic community has a very specific role to play. The tools of critical thinking and social analysis are part of the wealth of higher educational resources, and these are the most significant contributions that our Catholic colleges and universities should make.

But it is recognized that no true and lasting education arises from isolated academic reflection. Linked to these scientific skills must be motivational factors; classroom instruction in the social teaching of the church must be inspirited by an experience of injustice in the inner city, the migrant worker fields, the immigration office, or the local "red-lining" bank. When opportunities can be given to faculty and students for some such experiential learning, the study of economic systems and sociological data come alive. Bad mistakes have been made in the past both by social activists (within and outside the Catholic community) who had little or no knowledge of economic theory or practice and, on the other hand, academic theorists with no previous exposure to different cultural groups within our country or overseas. There must be a laboratory in which we come to recognize our assumptions and come to terms with our prejudices; this is provided when an experience of community service is coupled with a skillfully directed seminar at the home base. The program in process of development at Wheeling College is a good example — students live for a semester in Appalachia with weekly visits from college faculty who lead them in reflection and study. The "Urban Plunge" program at the University of Notre Dame is another example of this effort to link experience with curricular design.

Each campus is urged to provide retreats or seminars where this kind of integrated activity can take place. Some have begun from one end — i.e. the experiential — and then seen the need to give it solid foundation in the academic area; others have started with curriculum revision to offer courses with a Peace/Justice content and have then proceeded to involve the students in projects of community service which provide both a testing ground for what they have already learned and a motivational goal to further choices of courses and careers. No one tries to predict the direction or path of development; the process followed is rather one of listening and guiding. There is no one way to do Justice Education — there are only multiple devices for helping people achieve a good and workable approach for their own campus.

In order to help them do this, ACCU established in February of 1978 a National Advisory Council on Justice Education. A distinguished group of persons active in higher education and/or Catholic social action groups has been asked to meet twice each year and review the reports submitted by the pilot schools on their respective programs. A critique is then offered to each school and suggestions for further development may be made. In addition, the Advisory Council is asked to offer criticism and suggestions to the staff of ACCU concerning this whole area of their endeavor. The staff's main function is that of a catalyst and/or connector. We have helped in the initial design of each campus's program; now we hope that by sharing their experiences with other members of ACCU, the benefits will be multiplied. We are also planning to prepare a useful Bibliography on College/University Resources for Education for Justice. Let us know your interests and how we can help you. To "do the work of Justice" should be a characteristic of all our efforts — individually and collectively.

Alice Gallin, O.S.U.
Associate Executive Director, ACCU

REFLECTIONS ON EDUCATION FOR JUSTICE

Education for Social Justice — A Christian Perspective

William J. Byron, S.J.

To put a Christian perspective on education for justice is a structural approach, not a simple adjustment in the angle of vision. To specify social justice, not justice alone as an educational objective, is also a structural specification. I shall discuss each of these points separately. First, what new reality is involved in a Christian approach to justice? Second, how does social justice differ from inter-personal justice and what, if any, are the implications for those who would attempt to educate for social justice?

In considering all that follows, the reader might consider as well an etymological suggestion. Issues of social justice are structural concerns. Would not etymology suggest that instruction, normally associated with education, might have some important relationship to the construction or reconstruction of the social order?

I.

For the Jewish contemporaries of Jesus, the Kingdom of God connoted the realization of the idea of a just ruler. As Walter Kasper puts it, "In that ancient Middle Eastern conception, justice did not consist primarily in impartial judgments, but in help and protection for the helpless, weak and poor. The coming of the Kingdom of God was expected to be the liberation from unjust rule and the establishment of the justice of God in the world."[1]

In that context and to those contemporaries, Jesus proclaimed his message, "The Kingdom of God is at hand" (Mk. 1:15). He added to that proclamation the instruction to "repent" and to "believe the gospel." Hence, a response to his proclamation required both faith and an attitudinal change, a *metanoia.* Something new, some hoped-for relief from unjust and exploitative rule was, with the arrival of Jesus in human history, "at hand." Something new, some change of heart on the part of those who received the proclamation would be required to permit that which was "at hand" to be accepted, to take hold.

Those whose work is Christian education are laboring for the establishment of that same Kingdom of God, a kingdom of justice and peace, a kingdom which is still at hand but not yet grasped, not yet fully realized.

Christian education is a ministry of the Church. It is in and of the Church, a Church which is a community, a pilgrim people, on the way to Kingdom.

It is important to understand the meaning of the term "Kingdom," as Jesus used it. It is not a place. It is a rule, a reign, a leadership

> *. . . which develops from Yahweh's absolute power and shows itself in the guidance of Israel. This original meaning, that Yahweh as king actively "rules," must be kept in mind through the whole growth of the kingdom theme. God's kingship in the Bible is not characterized by latent authority, but by the exercise of power, not by an office but a function, it is not a title, but a deed.*[2]

Jesus proclaimed himself to be the doer of that deed, the holder of that power. Kingdom is an exercise of power. The power to establish justice is the Lord's. The task to work for justice is ours. And the pity of it all is the fact that the power indeed is "at hand" and has been at hand for 2000 years, but the egalitarian characteristics of the Kingdom have not yet taken hold because the response to the proclamation has, to date, carried with it an insufficient change of heart, an insufficient attitudinal change, an unwillingness on the part of those who "have" to "let go" for the benefit of those who are deprived.

Jesus' own preaching of the Kingdom destroys our own closely held preconceptions; it challenges the hearer toward value reversal. The poor, not the rich, are "blessed," he says (Mt. 5:3); the persecuted, not the comfortable, are "blessed" as well (Mt. 5:10). As John R. Donahue, S.J., has commented, there are very direct social implications in the Kingdom proclamation because Jesus shatters the social conventions of his time by making, as the sign of the arrival of the Kingdom, his fellowship with the outcasts of society. The teaching of Jesus reveals a very clear preference for the poor. He displays what might be

called a compensatory bias, a characteristic impulse to use his power to empower the powerless. He tries to move, by example, by persuasion and by threat of damnation, the heart of the unjust oppressor in order to bring relief to the victim of oppression. There is no "unrightable wrong" in face of his person and power. There are only resistant hearts and closed minds in the face of his gospel proclamation.

But what is new or different in a Christian approach to justice? What did Jesus add to earlier understandings of justice? To answer this it is necessary to consider justice as Jesus taught it. This is particularly important for Christian educators who are called, as the title of the American Bishops' 1972 pastoral on Catholic education puts it, "To Teach As Jesus Did."

Justice, as Jesus taught it, is something different from the justice of Plato and Aristotle.

Before explicitly examining justice as Jesus taught it, I want to make the following assertion, intended neither to offend or unsettle anyone: Only a Christian society will be a just society. Behind that statement stands a personal faith commitment and vocational choice.

I want further to assert that education for justice must be, in some recognizable form, Christian education. To the extent that this sounds outrageously arrogant, it measures with accuracy the sinfulness, the social sinfulness of the Christian people. It also measures the distance between the contemporary Christian community and the Kingdom which was announced, 2000 years ago, to be "at hand."

There is continuity, not discontinuity between Old Testament and New. The continuity resides in the person and teaching of Jesus. In tracing the continuity from Old Testament origins to New Testament specifications, I begin with a famous text from the Book of Micah:

> *What is good has been explained to you, man;*
> *This is what Yahweh asks of you:*
> *only this, to act justly,*
> *to love tenderly*
> *and to walk humbly with your God.* (Mi. 6:8)

Justice, as Jesus taught it, involved a conscious and explicit integration of those two ideas, "to act justly," and "to love tenderly." Cold, impartial "treating-equals-equally" or "every-man-his due" understandings of justice fall short of the mark set by Jesus for the Christian. From either a personal or social perspective, the root problems he set out to correct, it seems to me, are all reducible to powerlessness, poverty and indignity. The means he chose to employ in correcting them were educational. He taught by word and example the unity of justice and love. "To act justly," according to the example and teaching of Jesus, meant also "to love tenderly." Love without justice is not Christian love. Justice without love is not Christian justice.

Where do I find this New Testament specification? The Fordham theologian Charles H. Giblin, S.J., suggested in a lecture some years ago that Luke 15 presents justice in a new way, in the context of mercy and love. That particular chapter in Luke contains three parables on God's mercy. They were addressed to the Pharisees and the scribes who "complained," says Luke, because "the tax collectors and the sinners . . . were all seeking his company to hear what he had to say" (Lk. 15:1). The most famous of those three parables, directed in Luke's grouping toward the scribes and the Pharisees, is the story of the Prodigal Son. But as Fr. Giblin observed, it is the dialogue with the elder son that reveals an underdeveloped notion of justice, an unawareness of the necessary integration of justice with love. The dutiful ("every man his due") elder son will have to change his notion of justice in order to enter into the celebration. If he chooses not to change, he may not go into the house. He must "repent," undergo a *metanoia,* if he is to accept the new understanding which is there "at hand."

In the tenth chapter of St. Luke another duty-obligation story makes the same point, but much more dramatically. It is the parable of the Good Samaritan. First there is the question, "What must I do to inherit eternal life?" In reply, Jesus repeats the Old Testament instruction to love your neighbor "as yourself." Then the lawyer who had posed the prior question asks, "And who is my neighbor?" The reply this time is a parable about an abandoned victim of a roadside beating and robbery. Along in close succession come a dutiful priest and a dutiful Levite who see the victim but pass him by. Their sense of duty did not move them to assist the man. According to their assessment, apparently, duty required no action of them in that particular situation. "But a Samaritan traveler who came upon him was moved with compassion when he saw him." Compassion enters the instruction, and through the instruction compassion, mercy and love enter the structure of a Christian response to powerlessness, poverty and indignity. The rest of the parable further elaborates the notion of justice as Jesus taught it.

This, it seems to me, is a specifically Christian development. It is a development of, not discontinuous with, the Old Testament teaching. Consider Hosea:

> *And I will betroth you to myself forever;*
> *I will betroth you to myself in righteousness*
> *and justice,*
> *And in kindness and mercy.* (Hos. 2:21)

All the elements are there in Hosea. They are specifically integrated in the person and teaching of Jesus.

Consider Amos proclaiming the Lord's preference for right over rite:

> *I reject your oblations,*
> *and refuse to look at your sacrifices of fattened*
> *cattle.*
> *Let me have no more of the din of your chang-*
> *ing,*

no more of your strumming on harps.
But let justice flow like water,
and integrity like an unfailing stream.
(Amos 5:22-24)

As Shalom Spiegel points out, the very word that Amos used, *sedaqah,* came to mean in later times "justice made clairvoyant by love, i.e., charity."[3]

The "startling and distinctive note in the Christian message," according to Johannes Metz, is the idea that the love of neighbor is not something different from the love of God; "it is merely the earthly side of the same coin."[4] Similarly, the startling and distinctive note in the Christian view of justice is the conscious and explicit integration of justice with love. The beaten and robbed traveler, the oppressed, deprived and subjugated human person is also, as a result of the Incarnation of Jesus, the image of God himself. In our encounters with such persons, we encounter God. When we pass such a person by, we pass by our God. "Our human brother now becomes a 'sacrament' of God's hidden presence among us, a mediator between God and man."[5] Such is the Christian view.

This concludes the development of my first point concerning the new reality involved in a Christian approach to justice. It remains now to explore the differences between social and interpersonal or individual justice, and to examine the implications of those differences for those who would educate for social justice.

II.

"As He died to make men holy let us live to make men free," is a solemn and familiar line from the "Battle Hymn of the Republic." This is one way of stating the dramatic challenge confronting the Christian in quest of social justice. Let Christians, in their various social groupings, live in a way that promotes freedom for those in other social groupings. Such living will reflect the values of him who died to make us holy. One such value is justice integrated with love.

In considering social justice, I have in mind group-to-group relationships. Hence, relatedness between the groups must be presupposed before one group may be said to have a justice relationship to another group. I find it helpful to use the framework of the traditional symbolism of the scales of justice to look for relatedness in situations of social injustice. Social injustice affects a group, a disadvantaged group occupying the up tray on the imbalanced scale. What group occupies the down tray? In matters of social injustice, the occupants of the counterpart down tray will normally have to "let go," give something up before the trays can be brought into balance. And balance, of course, symbolizes a condition of justice between the groups.

Social justice includes both legal justice (which intends the common good) and distributive justice (which intends the good of each individual as a member of the group), but social justice focuses not on legal rights and obligations but rather on the natural rights and obligations *of the group* in relationship to other groups.

It is a mistake, in my view, to label certain one-to-one relationships as relationships of social justice simply because the disadvantaged beneficiary of that particular exchange is black, or poor, or identified with an oppressed minority group. A helping or saving initiative from the advantaged individual to the disadvantaged individual may, indeed, be not only an act of charity but an instance of justice as Jesus taught it. Recall the Good Samaritan. But it is not necessarily helpful to the group — either group, the helping or the helped. Hence, it is not really an instance of social justice. If the repentance, the change of heart, the *metanoia* does not touch the group which takes its advantage at the expense of the other group (that is precisely what relatedness may imply), then the structural support for the imbalance will be neither weakened nor changed.

Similarly, if a person-to-group initiative (say, an individual landlord to an entire neighborhood) benefits the disadvantaged group without moving others in the advantaged group toward structural change, this falls short, in my view, of a social justice relationship because there is no social group (in this case, say, a board of realtors) on one side of the initiative although there is such a group on that side. It is difficult these days to get people to do things together! All the more difficult is it to get groups to take justice initiatives toward other groups.

Social justice looks to all members of the group. In a context of obligation, social justice looks for a group initiative, a group response to a need. Typically, such a need will be rooted in powerlessness, poverty or human indignity, three signs of the absence of the Kingdom of God. Each member of the group (however defined, by whatever affiliation) has a personal obligation to be just. Not only is it a personal obligation to be just in individual-to-individual and individual-to-group relationships, it is also a personal obligation to promote one's proper group response to social injustice. So although I take the position that the just act of one person toward a disadvantaged person or group is not, strictly speaking, an act of social justice, I do not at all deny that an individual can place an act of social justice. Such actions would be taken within and toward one's own group in an effort to activate a justice response from that group toward another. Perhaps I am being too restrictive. If so, it is only to make an important point about where education for social justice might best begin.

If education for social justice might be characterized as educating "persons for others," it is important that attention be given to appropriate strategies and stages of the outward thrust. It will avail little if it is an isolated, individual initiative. This is not to say that isolated, individual initiatives are of no avail. Evidence to the contrary includes a glorious Christian tradition of heroic individual

and even small-group initiatives. But despite these the Kingdom remains "at hand" as we approach the year 2000, but out of reach for the millions who experience powerlessness, poverty and human indignity.

Education for social justice must begin with the group that impedes the flow of justice, that fends off a reign of justice and peace that has been "at hand" for nearly 2000 years. Such education must begin inside the Christian community, within its various groups and affiliations. Such education will have to be specialized as well as general. It will have to touch both young and old. It will have to be especially effective with those who have access to power. Education for social justice must be based on good theology and good social science. Social justice deserves a high place on the agenda of the intellectuals of the Church.

That which is to be understood and taught at all levels is a sense of solidarity with all of humankind, an awareness that solidarity means power, and an understanding of the techniques of organization needed to activate power. Whether power is directed toward just or unjust ends, as the Christian gospel defines them, depends in no small measure on whether or not the Christian conscience sets the direction of human activity. The challenge of all of this to Christian education is awesome, so too is the importance of the Christian educator. Let me end with a special word about the teacher in the task of social justice.

III

Sigmund Freud saw that a great person's influence on others would happen in two says:

> *. . . through his personality and through the idea for which he stands. This idea may lay stress on an old group of wishes in the masses, or point to a new aim for their wishes, or, again, lure the masses by other means.*[4]

Perhaps there is no older "group of wishes" in the people than the wish for justice, particularly that justice which the Christian tradition views as inextricably bound up with love. The Christian teacher who would educate for social justice must embody both love and justice at the level of personality and must internalize the justice-love integration as an "idea for which he stands." More is called for here than Greek impartiality or the "blind" justice of American jurisprudence. A bias toward the poor is called for. A continuing sensitivity to powerlessness and indignity is essential for anyone hopeful of educating for social justice.

A sober self-assessment and practical humility should also accompany the teacher's approach to groups or individuals within groups. Such an assessment can be taken by reflecting on Henri DeLubac's words:

> *If you are not yourself in a position to profit from injustice and if you do not have to make any effort to overcome this temptation, you must show complete moderation in your manner of fighting injustice in others. It is important not to forget, too, that many who protest in the name of justice would only like — in good faith perhaps — to be the strongest and most favored themselves.*[7]

It is DeLubac who also offers the caution that "teachers of religion are always liable to transform Christianity into a religion of teachers."[8] The Church is not a school; it is a community of believers, an incredible assembly of loved sinners. Such awareness is an indispensable part of the Christian perspective on education for social justice.

A teacher should be courageously prophetic. The truths about justice are not likely to comfort those who face a reduction in property, prestige or power as the principles of justice gain wider acceptance. The prophetic teacher can expect resistance, rejection and even unjust retaliation. But the quality of the great teacher which is not always part of the prophetic charism is the gift of patience. Some mistake this as timidity or unenlightened conservatism. But this need never be the case. What the teacher lacks in prophetic courage may be offset by a reserve of patience sufficient to retain serenity and peace of soul in an imperfect world where diverse peoples and nations are, by God's grace, becoming less and less unequal. The process is underway. The power to bring about a rule of justice resides in the Lord. The patient and persistant educator can help to lower the resistance and thus bring that hoped-for reign of justice that much closer in his or her own time. As more teaching hands turn to the task of education for social justice, the rule of justice will remain less elusively "at hand" and become more fully grasped and comprehended.

William J. Byron, S.J., is President of the University of Scranton.

NOTES

1. *Jesus the Christ* (London: Burns : Oates, 1976), p. 73.
2. R. Schnackenburg, *God's Rule and the Kingdom* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), p. 13. John R. Donahue, S.J., who teaches New Testament at Vanderbilt University, has been a great help in directing me to this and other works on the notion of the Kingdom of God.
3. *Amos versus Amaziah* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1957), p. 54.
4. *Poverty of Spirit* (Paramus, N.J.: Newman Press, 1968), p. 33.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Moses and Monotheism,* tr. by Kathleen Jones (New York: Vantage Books, 1939), p. 139.
7. *Further Paradoxes* (London: Longmans, Green, 1958), p. 55.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 117.

Justice and Peace: The Place and the Potential of Colleges and Universities

J. Bryan Hehir

The transition in the papacy from Pope Paul VI through John Paul I to John Paul II marked the end of the post-conciliar era. The pontificate of Paul VI was absorbed by the difficult task of implementing Vatican II. The ministry of John Paul II will entail new initiatives as well as continuing implementation. One of the abiding themes of the post-conciliar period which surely will continue in the church of John Paul II is the ministry of justice and peace. As a dimension of the church's ministry, the work of justice and peace is in some sense the responsibility of all the People of God. While affirming the universality of the responsibility, it is equally necessary to specify the distinct contributions which different vocations and institutions in the church can make to shaping the church as a more effective instrument of the Kingdom in history.

The single most important theological locus of the justice and peace ministry in the conciliar and post-conciliar period has been *The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.* A passage from this document establishes the linkage between the work of justice and peace and the vocation of a Catholic college or university. In paragraph 15 the Council Fathers say, "the future of the world is in danger unless provision is made for men of greater wisdom." The cultivation of wisdom involves both competence in empirical knowledge and a religious-moral vision which can provide direction and purpose to secular competence. To assess the potential of colleges and universities to shaping people of wisdom in the council's sense of the term this paper will proceed in three steps: 1) stating the theological basis of the justice and peace ministry; 2) proposing an objective of this ministry in which institutions of higher learning can play a unique role; and 3) examining the requisite elements for playing this role.

I. The Theological Basis of Justice and Peace

The theological foundation of all of the church's specific actions in the social ministry is defined in *The Pastoral Constitution.* The church, says the Council, should stand as the sign and safeguard of the transcendence of the human person. Briefly stated, the protection and promotion of the dignity of the person is the basis of all of the church's social ministry. The dignity of the person, grounded theologically in the doctrine of the person as the *Imago Dei,* and philosophically in the spiritual nature of the person, is articulated in Catholic teaching by a doctrine of rights and responsibilities, claimed by each person as a direct extension of human dignity. Since the protection and promotion of human rights, as well as the consistent fulfillment of human duties, is related to the social structure in which the person lives, the church's commitment to human dignity, rights and responsibilities requires that it exercise a ministry of justice and peace designed to address the political, economic and social structure in the name of the person. To use the words of Pius XII, the person should be the foundation, the end and the agent of the social system.

The theological grounding of the social ministry of the church has been clearly and consistently stated throughout the twentieth century in the tradition of the papal social encyclicals. The strength of these documents lay in their sophisticated mix of theological and philosophical themes, yielding a body of moral and social doctrine at once strong and subtle. The liability of the traditional social teaching lay in its underdeveloped ecclesiology. Little attention was paid in the social teaching of Leo XIII, Pius XI, or even Pius XII, to delineating a clear link between the social ministry of the church and the nature and mission of the church. The principal contribution of the consiliar and post-conciliar period to the social ministry has been to close the ecclesiological gap in the social teaching.

The basic eeclesiological statement is found in *The Pastoral Constitution.* The significance of the document lies less in any sentence, paragraph or passage than in its fundamental affirmation that a total ecclesiology requires not only the reflection *ad intra* of *The Dogmatic Constitution of the Church,* but also a correlative explanation of "the presence and function of the Church in the world today." (para. 2) The perspective of the Council was that the specific mission of the church is religious in its nature and purpose, yet in pursuing this religious ministry the church contributes to three socio-political objectives: 1) protecting the dignity of the person; 2) fostering the unity of the human family and 3) informing human activity with deeper meaning and purpose. These activities, the basic themes of justice and peace ministry, are endowed with religious significance by *The Pastoral Constitution,* and are described as flowing from the very nature of the church's mission and ministry. When this line is drawn the entire social teaching of the church takes on new significance because it has been placed in an explicitly theological framework.

The theological design shaped by *The Pastoral Constitution* was not simply a conciliar achievement, but initiated a

process of post-conciliar reflection on the nature and ministry of the church *ad extra*, "in the world of today." The substantial relationship between *The Pastoral Constitution* and the 1971 Synod's document *Justice in the World* is manifest in the strong ecclesiological tenor of the Synod's statement. The passage which has made this document a *locus classicus* in post-conciliar theology is principally an ecclesiological affirmation:

> *Action on behalf of justice and participation in the transformation of the world fully appear to us as a constitutive dimension of the preaching of the Gospel, or, in other words, of the Church's mission for the redemption of the human race and its liberation from every oppressive situation.* (Justice in the World, *1971*)

The value of this statement lies in its specificity; it identifies the social ministry (action for justice and transformation of the world) as constitutive, i.e., central to the mission of the church. The specificity of the passage has made it useful but also controversial. The controversy is the product of the strength of the assertion. Adjectives like constitutive are used rarely and carefully in Catholic theology. All agree, for example, that the celebration of the sacraments and the preaching of the Gospel are constitutive dimensions of ministry. It is not forcing the synodal text to see in it a movement of theological development, from implicit to explicit affirmation, in which the prophetic theme of justice contained in the preaching of the Gospel has been made an explicit element in defining the mission of the church. The controversy over the synodal text has arisen precisely in reaction to such interpretations of the text.

The debate about the 1971 text continued in the Synod of 1974, finding expression in both Pope Paul VI's opening address and in his document *On Evangelization in the Modern World* (1975). Although the categories used in this remarkable letter are not identical with *The Pastoral Constitution* or *Justice in the World*, the substantive issue is the same: how related the religious ministry of the church to its work for human dignity and the transformation of the world. Pope Paul strongly affirmed the linkage of these concepts, but was intent upon not weighing the ministry of justice and peace too strongly. The same tenor, positive but cautious, is reflected in The International Theological Commission's study, *Declaration on Human Development and Christian Salvation* (1977). The Commission declares explicitly that the 1971 statement about a constitutive dimension of ministry "is still controversial." The Commission defines the justice and peace ministry as integral but nonessential for the church. The tendency is to draw back from the full force of the original text, but it is a tendency not a final word. The church is in the midst of an exciting debate about its mission in the world.

The significance of the debate initiated by *The Pastoral Constitution* and *Justice in the World* can be appreciated only if one recognizes how the absence of a clear ecclesiological statement about the ministry of justice and peace has confined such activity to a marginal position in the church's ministry in the past. Catholicism has been possessed of a strong social doctrine but a less than adequate understanding of how to relate the objectives of that doctrine to the total activity of the church. This question, one of theological understanding and pastoral priorities, affects the daily life and witness of the church. It will not be settled by a precise definition, but it will be affected in the long-run by the categories used to state and explain the Church's ministry.

The concern of theologians and other members of the Catholic intellectual community should be to avoid becoming prisoners of distinctions, but to appreciate the significance of the issue at stake. The need of the moment, which Catholic colleges and universities are by vocation equipped to face, is a task of integration, a work of systematization, which makes available to the People of God at all levels an understanding of the church's ministry, simultaneously rooted in a transcendent faith, yet yielding a daily involvement in the works of justice and peace.

II. The Church as Community of Conscience

The second challenge for colleges and universities is also ecclesiological, but exists at different levels of the church's life. It is the task of finding a legitimate public expression of the theological vision contained in *The Pastoral Constitution* and *Justice in the World*. The issue is practical: what shape should the church assume in fulfilling its ministry as the sign and safeguard of the person in society.

The dimensions of the question are set by two texts from the magisterial teaching of the last decade. In *The Pastoral Constitution*, the Council states a principle: "Christ, to be sure, gave His Church no proper mission in the political, economic or social order. The purpose which he set before her is a religious one. But out of this religious mission itself came a function, a light and an energy which can serve to structure and consolidate the human community according to the divine law." The principle reflects the debate rehearsed in Part One of this paper: how to understand and to extend a religiously based ministry into the social arena. The principle is a "minimalist" statement; it affirms a role for the church but lays stress upon the limits of ecclesial competence and vocation in the socio-political order. A countervailing statement, "maximalist" in tenor is found in Paul VI's apostolic letter, *The Eightieth Year* (1971). In this creative but thus far almost unknown document, the Pope makes the strongest plea I am aware of in Catholic teaching for understanding the political vocation as part of the Christian vocation.

First, in paragraph 46, the Holy Father stresses the objective importance of politics, stressing the need "to pass from economics to politics," because "each man feels that

in the social and economic field, both national and international, the ultimate decision rests with political power." Second, he goes on to state the significance of political activity: "To take politics seriously at its different levels — local, regional, national and worldwide — is to affirm the duty of man, of every man, to recognize the concrete reality and the value of the freedom of choice that is offered to him to seek to bring about both the good of the city and of the nation and of mankind."

It would be entirely too limited an understanding of the papal intent to restrict this paragraph solely to those who are politicians by profession. A more adequate exegesis involves thinking through the political vocation of the Christian community which in turn is the context of the more specific calling of some members of the community. If these two statements, *The Pastoral Constitution* and *The Eightieth Year,* are taken in tandem the ecclesiological question which emerges is: what pastoral conception of the church grounds the social ministry in its religious foundation, but allows it to foster the political vocation of the Christian community?

On the one hand it is clear from *The Pastoral Constitution* that the church should not be conceived as a political party in any sense. Nor should one think of the contribution of the church, in the first instance, as a research institute. Christians in their diverse vocations, especially Christians in colleges and universities, will contribute to the work of justice and peace precisely in terms of research and analysis. But the principal role of the church, *qua* church, must be more broadly defined.

For the sake of analysis and discussion on the part of those in colleges and universities, I would propose the concept of the church as a community of conscience. The unique potential of the church in addressing the issues of justice and peace is its ability to create a community of conscience, an identifiable constituency within the larger civil society with a distinct angle of vision on questions affecting human dignity, human rights and the unity of the human family (to use the language of *The Pastoral Constitution*). The concept of community of conscience is proposed here as a framework for analysis not a finished product. To foster the discussion, I will cite some characteristics of the concept which make it potentially useful.

First, it is a concept which includes everyone in the church: all are potentially members of the community of conscience, although there are distinct roles to be played in forming it. Second, in conceiving these distinct roles one should maximize freedom of initiative: a community of conscience requires an "Activist" institutional posture for the church on social issues, but it also requires that institutional positions be put forward for free debate in the community. On these social issues the continuing concern of the magisterium for pluralism regarding contingent political choices should be preserved. Third, in fostering such a sustained debate about social issues the church is acting from a religious base and fulfilling its teaching ministry.

Finally, it is possible to assess the political potential of this community of conscience model for the church. One problem with trying to involve the whole church in the justice and peace dimension of ministry is a sense of frustration that the issues are removed and influenced only by small groups of specialized actors (technicians or politicians). While a complex industrial democracy does invest significant power in its political and technically trained elites, it is no less true that the elites function within a more broadly defined ambit of public opinion. There is an atmosphere of opinion which surrounds key issues in a society without determining in a technical sense how they will be decided. Issues as diverse as The Panama Canal, Proposition 13 and the forthcoming SALT II debate manifest this characteristic. To touch the ambit of opinion on these issues is to help set the context for decision; the circle of opinion sets the margin of movement for decision-makers without predetermining their choices. Conceiving the church as a community of conscience is a means of projecting the church into this crucial area between public opinion and policy decisions.

The creation of a community of conscience on the questions of justice and peace is a multifaceted task in the church. It involves styles of leadership, pastoral practice and educational policies. Colleges and universities can be crucially significant centers for the formation of a community of conscience. This is not their only contribution to the ministry of justice and peace, but it is one for which they are uniquely suited. The potential of colleges and universities rests with both the resources they have available and with the crucial learning moment when they are in contact with members of the church. The realization of this potential requires an assessment of specific tasks within the college or university community.

III. The Resources of the Campus

It is an easier task for one person to summarize the theological rationale of the justice and peace ministry or even to propose general ideas of implementation than it is to specify in any detail the role and requirements of a single institution within the church. Determining these specific tasks is a process better undertaken by several people who are functioning daily within the institution. Allow me, therefore, simply to indicate four suggestions which build upon the specific character of the college or university world and which provide links to the justice and peace ministry.

First, the method of the ministry: it is necessary to resist the idea that the best or only way to fulfill the college or university role is to institute a specific curriculum of justice and peace studies. This is a means and an important one, but in isolation it will not be successful. Just as the work of justice and peace must be integrated throughout the whole church if it is to be a "constitutive/integral" element of

ministry, so the work of justice and peace has to be seen as the province of several disciplines and functions of the university if it is to mark the character of its educational mission. Briefly, the justice and peace themes should not be isolated in the theology or religious studies department. The principal responsibility may well be rooted there, but the ministry cannot be contained there.

Second, the content of the justice and peace experience: it is helpful to remember the injunction on "Education for Justice" of the 1971 Synod. Justice education should be a blend of theory and practice. Constructing options for this to occur again requires the involvement of several segments of the campus.

Third, the quality of justice and peace programs: having just called for a mix of theory and practice (a difficult task in itself), it is equally necessary to warn against reducing the justice and peace themes to "practical" (i.e., nonacademic) dimensions. The justice and peace dimensions of the curriculum need to be held to the same academic standards as the rest of the academic program. If that does not occur, the whole idea will soon fall in disrepute in college or university circles. Nothing would be more damaging to the long-term viability of the justice and peace work on campuses.

Fourth, some categories for reflection: the contribution of a college or university to a person's life is by nature long-range. One tries in a process of higher education to impact the basic categories of a person's thinking and habit of acting. Two concepts which are centrally related to the idea of a community of conscience and directly pertinent to the educational process are those of *vocation* and *citizenship.* The concept of vocation can shape religious, moral, intellectual and personal themes into a coherent framework of life. It seems too little cultivated today, almost as if it were too comprehensive an idea for a specialized age. The idea of citizenship relates directly to Pope Paul's comments on the primacy of the political in society. Both ideas are pertinent to Vatican II's call for people of greater wisdom. Wisdom in the Catholic tradition is a blend of knowledge, experience, qualities of judgement, and not least, gifts of the Spirit.

To meet the Council's call for people of wisdom involves drawing from our traditions of faith, reason and spirituality. To state this is to recognize the dimensions of the challenge facing colleges and universities in the justice and peace ministry.

J. Bryan Hehir is Associate Secretary, Office of International Justice and Peace, United States Catholic Conference.

Education in a Global Perspective

Laurence T. Murphy, M.M.

To seek a better and more just society is a goal not limited by national horizons. Indeed . . . the question of international education is of the warp and woof of the business of higher education, because in its own way it raises the question of goals for a Catholic college or university. As Walter Kaufmann notes in *The Future of the Humanities,* the failure to think about goals is perilous in times of rapid change.[1] Thus the question of international education, which is primarily the question of bringing to students a vision of the reality of human living on a small, contentious and interdependent planet, should be seen in terms of two major historical developments since the end of World War II.

Educators know that the world today is and has been in a state of very rapid change over the last thirty years. The explosion of knowledge, especially in terms of technology, the population problem, the political environment, the fragility of international economic and political institutions, the obvious interdependence of nations, and in particular the case of the nearly one billion people who live in extreme poverty in the so-called third world — all these contribute to the coming of age of a new world. John W. Sewell writes of this as the emergence of global political and economic interdependence on a scale hardly imaginable twenty-five years ago. This interdependence, he points out, has been manifested in such seemingly unrelated phenomena as continued "Stagflation" in the industrialized economies, the depletion of the world's fisheries, the continuing threat of a world food shortage, and the impact of a fourfold increase in the price of oil.[2] Americans have come to realize that the social costs of problems such as population growth, the migration of peoples, terrorism, and narcotics traffic can only be dealt with by cooperation among all nations, rich and poor.

Cultures too have been more and more drawn out of their parochial boundaries in such obvious areas as dress, hair styles, music, and consumption of material goods. Even conflicts have changed direction, with the East-West

division sharing the scene with the newer North-South differences. The great paradox is that as the world becomes increasingly interdependent (and therefore more vulnerable) it is also becoming increasingly fragmented and contentious.

The second great movement affecting us is the change from elitism to egalitarianism in higher education. This is of course particularly true within the industrialized countries. In the United States the initial impetus came from President Truman's Commission on Higher Education, and was facilitated by the G.I. "Bill of Rights" which made entry to college or university financially possible for the returning WW II veterans. The Commission concluded that half the American population could benefit from at least two years of education beyond high school, and a third had the capacity to earn a four-year college degree.[3] This mass movement, built on the changes already brought about by the land-grant colleges, provided the means of entry not only to the professions but to a wide range of new occupations. All of this has transformed the character of higher education and given rise to new problems of goals and purpose.

Roman Catholic colleges and universities must also come to terms with the great changes in the Church, and the consequent difference in the expectations of their students. The last fifteen years have been a stormy passage, and the question of what it means to be a *Catholic* institution has been a troublesome one. In the context of the three-fold structure proposed for all Catholic educators by the American bishops in their pastoral letter, *To Teach as Jesus Did* — i.e. doctrine, community, and service — international education would probably be understood best in terms of education for justice.[4] And for this, I submit that the point of departure is the scrutiny of the signs of the times.

I spoke of international education as a vision of the reality of human living in the contemporary world. This is an ancient quest, of course, made new by the expansion of our vision from the restricted one of Europe and North America to today's global society. But a vision must be rooted in the real world, and so our first and essential task is to help students become aware of the way the world is structured by its systems and institutions. It means that a knowledge of global concerns is at the heart and not the periphery of life. This raises two problems. First is the problem of competence. Who is prepared to teach these matters to undergraduates, especially given the academic specialization reflected in our departmental structures? The problems are immensely complex, often seeming intractable, and the temptation is to treat them by special programs or courses added on to the curriculum. This would simply be a veneer applied to the finished product. Such courses and programs may help a few to broaden their vision of the world, but it is unlikely that they will have significant effect on the university or its students.

The second problem is the one mentioned at the beginning of this article, the question of goals. Given the long history of avoidance of thinking about goals by students and teachers alike, this problem is acute. It means re-thinking the mission of the university, and of calling to account all the components of the university in terms of the mission. We ought not treat of the broad question raised here, but rather reflect on the particular question of the goal of education *as international,* which is a different thing from the goal of international education. The former sees the global dimension as central to the educational task; the latter sees it as a specialty. The former asserts that we are obligated to prepare students, as adequately as possible, to live in their world which *is* global. That is to say that no student can be adequately prepared for human life, for Catholic life, or even for professional life, unless he or she is educated to know global realities, appreciate global interdependence and diversity and understand the practical impact these will have on us all. Students must be helped to apply critical judgment to these matters analyzing the structures and systems of the world in terms of both their efficiency and of their justice. The relation of such critical analysis to Christian faith was made clear by the Synod of 1971.

In the practical order the question of mission, of basic goals, must be taken up at the highest level of administration as well as by the faculty. Each institution should have a clearly articulated statement of mission, and the administration should take pains that it not be mere rhetoric but a practical directive of institutional life. There some instrumentality should be established that will regularly call to account the components of the institution in terms of its mission. That means a policy decision to insist that practical ways be found to pursue the goals across the board.

It is the faculty above all which must be helped in its professional growth to recognize the implications of an interdependent world for all the disciplines. This requires provision for continuing professional education that takes cognizance of this need. Especially it asks of our faculty that they accept the notion of ministry that *is not* limited to the campus ministers or religious studies department, and that they accept the notion that each faculty person has responsibility for moral education.

Thereafter education for living on a small planet can be seen as a task directed at all students and not as the preparation of some students for foreign service, for international business, and so forth. It is a profoundly difficult task, and I do not know where it may be adequately carried on at present. Yet I believe it is also a matter of practical urgency.

That brings us back to the teaching of vision. There are some who hold in this alleged time of apathy that there is no appetite for vision. But I hold to the contrary that we are adequate to a more profound view of the human race and that indeed it is our birthright, and I am reminded of

the words of Edna St. Vincent Millay:

The world stands out on either side,
No wider than the heart is wide;
Above the world is stretched the sky,
No higher than the heart is high.

Laurence T. Murphy, M.M., is Professor of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies at Seton Hall University.

FOOTNOTES

1. *The Future of the Humanities,* Walter Kaufmann, Reader's Digest Press, 1977, p. 176.
2. *The United States and World Development,* John W. Sewell, Praeger, 1977, p. 1.
3. *From Elite to Mass to Universal Higher Education,* McConnell, Berdahl and Fay, University of California at Berkeley, 1973, p. 2.
4. *To Teach as Jesus Did,* United States Catholic Conference, Washington, November 1972, p. 72.

Justice . . . What is it All About?

David B. Burrell, C.S.C.

To speak of Education for Justice is, in one sense, simply to ask the question: "What ought we to do in the face of the inequities of our society?" "How do we discover what is *just*?" Concretely, in this paper I suggest a way of approaching these questions in regard to such issues as "development" and/or "foreign aid."[1]

Consider one of the more celebrated statistics: 6% of the world's people (U.S.A.) consume 40% of the world's resources. Without inquiring how this is calculated, it is not implausible. Yet even so great an inequity as this would not necessarily spell injustice. Consider that a mere 6% of the staff of any institution had use and control of 40% of the resources of the institution, yet through their stewardship they created in the place a fantastic environment for living and working. To do such a successful job they had to bend all their efforts towards the common good, and execute their roles with consummate finesse and integrity. Consider further that the staffs in some other institutions require less, but no other place is as well-managed as this one. Certainly the contribution of this tiny minority to the common enterprise would make the inequity in resources commanded worthwhile; in fact, if we could calculate the worth of their contribution, we would be somewhere near a proportional equality!

We may prefer greater participation than this suggests, but on sheer management grounds it would be self-defeating to campaign for more equitable distribution if the predictable effects would spell deterioration of the working environment. Aristotle suggests that we consider a fair measure of goods one which is proportioned to the relative merit of the individuals involved — however that merit be measured.[2] I have suggested one measure: contribution to a harmonious atmosphere for working and living.

1. A Scheme for Apportioning Justly

Aristotle's notion of proportional equity intends to capture the common notion of justice: everyone should be given a fair shake. 'Fair' means 'equal' only when we are dealing with a *respect* in which each one is equal. The notion of *fairness* implicitly includes that of *merit* (or *desert*) — so much so that we introduce deliberate handicaps when the aim is to *equalize.* That is, fairness includes a recognition of differences; things do not have to be leveled to be fair.

I would argue, then, that theories of distribution need not divide *between* merit and equality, but rather turn on the ways we assess *merit:* what respects we count and how we count them.[3] Hence if one says that *all* people should be given an equal opportunity, we might ask why they should. Is this a mere democratic prejudice? It could be, but we could also defend such a proposal as appropriate to a society that believes in a shared human potential.[4] Opposing positions would propose something akin to Aristotle's thesis of "natural slaves," or construct a justification of our standard Western attitude towards other peoples.

As Paul Streeten and others at the Institute for Development Studies in Sussex, England, elaborate an approach to "development" based on this concept, they present it as an alternative. Thus, they clarify the purpose of development: "to raise the sustainable level of living of the masses of poor people as rapidly as is feasible to provide all human beings with the opportunity to develop their full potential." Of course, most "poor countries will not be able to satisfy basic needs on their own within a reasonable time span without substantial assistance from outside." So it may sound like semantic sleight-of-hand to distinguish *aid* from *assistance.* Nevertheless the context makes clear that

Streeten could answer *no* if asked whether we should give aid to the poor. Assistance for development, yes; handouts, no. And much of the ambiguity which bedevils current debate turns on identifying *aid* with *handouts*.

Yet what allows Streeten to propose the goal he does for development, presuming that we will simply accept it as a base line for further discussion? Two interlocking convictions, I suggest, one of which I have already identified: the belief that each human being deserves such an opportunity. The other must be that the goods of the earth are meant to subserve those basic human needs. It must be part of our understanding of *resources* that they be "available to all to fill their needs." To speak of earth, air, fire and water as *resources* is to ascribe to them a destiny (or intentionality) prior to ownership. It is this grammatical fact, if you will, which allows Paul VI to remind us that "no one may appropriate surplus goods solely for his private use when others lack the necessities of life; the right of private property can never be exercised to the detriment of the common good."[3]

To retain what I do not need in the face of another's survival would be monstrous. I may have come to deserve more resources than another, because I have shown that I can put them to better use, but that "more" is quickly relativized by another's survival. If I claimed otherwise, I would be overlooking the "fact" that we share a common human potential, as well as implicitly claiming that my "better use" could take priority over his "basic needs." This latter would invert the order inscribed in the two senses of *merit:* the underlying sense in which each person *deserves* an equal opportunity, and the socially operative one in which rewards are scaled to performance.

We may easily muddy the abstract example, of course, by sketching a case: am I required to give of the *more* which I need to do my job, to support someone who isn't doing his? The answer of course is no. Sympathy may elicit something from you, but all he *deserves* is the opportunity. And yet the example pushes our considerations to a more profound level: what is the status of the *more* I need to do my job in the face of millions of people who lack the very opportunity to activate their human potential? Am I obligated to give up something of what I have — to "modify my life-style," if you will — to accommodate their more basic needs? Furthermore, what if my renunciations have no measurable effect on their status?

This question is at once pressing and distracting. There is a way of answering yes which presumes an ideal scheme of distribution. This form of justification so nettled Robert Nozick that he composed an account euphemistically titled a "theory of entitlement" to show that historical precedent outranks abstract schemes in arguments over assignment of goods. The theory offers a way of justifying the social arrangements we have come to accept, and shows one reason why our socio-economic structure tolerates the inequities which result.[4] But what about proposals for land reform, or other such redistribution schemes? Granted their small chance of success, are they to be deemed unjust? That is, can one argue that someone inheriting much more than he needs is actually *entitled* to the inheritance — in more than a legal sense? Must one try to argue that way, as a bulwark against the abstract schemes of policy planners? Are these the only alternatives?

Clearly they are not, and a middle way is available to us in Aristotle's notion of justice as proportional equity. Despite the mathematical background, the proportionality Aristotle proposes is not a decision scheme but a set of directions indicating the *kind* of judgments we will be required to make if we want to heed our inbuilt sense of fairness. Indeed, the scheme he offers is appropriately abstract; it is we ourselves who must settle on the relevant discriminating factors. The formula he offers will not distribute goods, but it does suggest lines along which those who make such decisions must be educated. And since all of us, if only by our habits of consumption and production, have *some* say in such decisions — however small — it is in our interest to discern those lines as they are germane to our continuing education.

2. Distracting Images for Rationality

Before exploring these lines leading to education for justice, however, we need to deal with one more legacy of our liberal infatuation with policy planning. The quest for impartial distribution schemes could be represented as a response to *fairness* because we allowed ourselves in the past to be persuaded — by appeals to complexity? — to settle for a non-participatory democracy in which officials carried out their responsibility for the common good by "solving *our* problems." A dominant image of "the machinery of government" reinforced our sense of powerlessness, and so enhanced the power of policy planners.[5] Indeed, a similar feeling pervades much current literature designed to show us how systemic injustice has become; that is, the argument neglects to remind us that it is in part we ourselves who empower the corporate powers by our acceptance of their value system: "that happiness is directly tied to an ever greater profusion of material goods — that consumption is happiness."[6]

We have been taught to look somewhere else for the source of the decisions affecting systemic features of our society — e.g. distribution of goods — and so would naturally prefer that this nameless, faceless process proceed as "impartially" as possible. So Aristotle's mathematical scheme loses its appropriate remove, and becomes a literal fantasy: that what we are looking for and wish to appeal to is a formula rendering just distribution. Perhaps the inherent ambiguity of Adam Smith's image of an "invisible hand" set us up for this particular sleight-of-hand; yet history has taught us that Adam Smith's image made the sense it did only because we could presume a host of

helping hands in the informal distribution (and re-distribution) schemes of interlocking communities. It is such communities, however, which the bureaucratic ideal of rationality, predicated solely on the rights of individuals, has sorely undermined.[9]

3. Related Misconceptions of Power

Furthermore, if the prevailing patterns of rationality ill serve us in learning how to make those proportional judgments which we have seen constitute just decisions, so do our common conceptions of power. Neighborhood organizers are busy doing battle with such misconceptions of power and their therapeutic slogan "empowerment" sums up their efforts. For it is not a matter of giving power back to the people, but of the people recognizing how much of the power is theirs. By shifting from the noun *power* to a verb *empower,* they encourage us to participate in an activity rather than be dominated by an alien object.

The rhetoric of neighborhood organization, however, often strikes us as more militant than their practices actually are — partly because they need to generate a good deal of momentum to crash the psychic barrier we have described: a collective conviction that someone else holds the power. But also because all of us tend to rely on the single expression *power* to cover what have long been recognized to be two quite distinct realities: *force* and *authority.* The distinction turns on legitimation, and the source of legitimacy lies in large part within ourselves. The steamroller or the man with a gun can force conformity but never acquiescence. Authority, on the other hand, governs me through my acquiescence. Such authority may at times have recourse to coercive power, but that is tolerated because of an acquiescence in the background. We permit a legitimate government to govern us, even at times to constrain us — that permission is part of its legitimacy. Since we use the expression *power* to cover both realities, we need to remind ourselves how we intend it: a powerful speaker may have a booming voice that forces my attention, or he may speak authoritatively with convincing argument — and he may do both.

The difference becomes especially telling when we overlook it. So I may be persuaded that the powers that dominate politically and economically are constraining me, when in fact I am authorizing their power over me. When I select a "prepared" product extravagantly packaged, I have helped an agribusiness to corner a market and have contributed to maldistribution. The effects are systemic, but my complicity is personal. There are disproportionalities involved which I can train myself to discern, so that I have some idea of the larger price I am paying in purchasing the product — that is, what the higher cost amounts to, and what I am supporting in paying it.

4. Political Barriers to Understanding

I have been maneuvering us by a series of steps towards a way of responding to the preferred form of our opening question: what should/can we do in the face of such incredible inequities? We have just now been threading our way through a common smokescreen: all those powerful *other* forces. I have chosen an example of economic power — a multinational agribusiness, but often our sense of powerlessness is reinforced by political factors — especially by national boundaries. So world-wide statistics on resource and consumption tell us that "one-third of the world's people now (1974) consume two-thirds of the world's minerals and energy,"[10] yet do not the South Africans and Saudi Arabians think of the uranium and oil that lies under *their* soil (i.e., within their boundaries) as *theirs* before they think of it as a certain percentage of the world's mineral resource? Don't Texans feel the same about *their* oil? Wouldn't we? (It matters little whether the laws in effect grant mineral rights to individuals or to states; either subject presumes ownership.)

One can argue against this presumption, of course; either as Paul VI did from God's intention, or as I have from the grammar inbedded in our talk about resources. Yet chauvinism seems relatively impervious to argument, and so, national hegemony contributes that much more to our sense of someone else having the power. This blockage can be felt so keenly that the only way out would seem to be some form of world government. At which point, of course, the entire quest for justice — or a "new international economic order" — joins the scrap heap of high-school debate topics, and we are freed to pursue business as usual. Yet what moved us to so remote a conclusion was the picture we have been carrying — of someone else making the decisions, and of experts devising the formulas which political managers can implement as policy.

Well this side of any dreams or schemes for world government, however, we are finding out that there *is* an international economic order — or disorder. Interdependence is a fact of foreign exchange, and domestic exchange reflects that interdependence directly. And vice-versa as well, as President Carter was told in every capital during his recent trip abroad: unless the United States manages to curb its energy demands, the dollar will continue to fall in comparative value. The concern of the interlocutors stemmed from a longstanding realization of how closely their economies were tied to the dollar; our concern should come from how startled we were that our consumption habits actually made a difference. As we continue to trace the implications of economic interdependence, in an effort to find our own way back to responsible action, we may be surprised to find in the multinational corporations a mediating factor. I say this despite the fact that few, if any, multinationals are authentically *multi-* or *trans-*national, any more than British colonialism was *colonial;* yet their

presence and formal organization may afford at least some conceptual ways through the barriers of national boundaries.

5. A Fair Assessment and a Norm: Sufficiency

The economic fact of interdependence helps us towards answering the question: what difference could what *we* do make? It takes an analytic science like economics to trace those otherwise invisible connections which can convince me of my ties to people living many thousands of miles away according to utterly different customs. And economists are far from clear about them, even though international monetary fluctuations display interdependence as a fact. Once we have become convinced of the fact, however, our initial considerations about resources force us to a clear conclusion. Put quite simply, it is that "the world . . . can no longer afford the production-consumption patterns of middle-class America."[11]

That is, given our conceptual argument in support of the "basic human needs" approach to development — an argument based at once on the meaning of *resources* and on the intrinsic potential worth of every human being — gether with the fact of economic interdependence, it makes good sense to say that the world cannot afford our lifestyle. Note how such a conclusion transposes the question: do we have an obligation to aid the poor? — or do less advantaged have a right to our surplus? — by questioning what many inquirers naturally presumed: do we have a right to live as we do? The negative answer I give to this question is supported in part by pervasive facts about international interdependence. But in the form the question finally took, one could defend a negative response from the relatively noncomparative norm of sufficiency. This is merely another way of saying that our current lifestyle would be easier to defend if it were not so patently ridiculous!

In speaking of *sufficiency* as a norm in matters of justice, I am quite aware how elastic a notion it is.[12] I have adopted it deliberately in order to allude to cognate criteria like elegance, simplicity, and fruitfulness. For we think of these as more aesthetic than ethical notions, and bringing aesthetic notions to bear on issues of justice should direct us more towards *order* than towards adjudicating adverse claims. Modern discussions of justice have tended to begin with the rights of individuals, and thence inquire into the obligations these entailed for others. Classical treatments of justice sought to establish an order, and thence adjudicate what was owed to persons according to their roles in that order.

Many cultural currents have militated against our thinking in these terms in more recent times. One of these was certainly a modesty about metaphysical claims — and 'order' invokes metaphysics; another stems from the tendency to make justice co-extensive with legal justice, and the minimal state eschewed comprehensive questions about aim, goal, or order. Yet more recently, the facts of international economic dependency have forced discussions of justice beyond the framework of legal justice. The expressly minimal political notion of *rights* cannot do justice to the complexity of human relationships, so that ethicists are increasingly calling our asttention to the multiple orders inscribed in human interactions and overlooked by a simple framework of rights: social roles and relationships.[13]

Finally, ecological concerns have sensitized us to a way of thinking about human beings in relation to the world which invokes all of the sophisticated interaction lore available from systems theory. In short, it seems that discussions of *order* have been forced upon us. To paraphrase my earlier response to our crucial question: we cannot afford any longer *not* to think systemically. In fact, nothing but the illusion of a world and a self without limits ever allowed us to dispense with reflections on order.[14]

To insist that we take the risk of formulating the order constitutive of our world, however, need not imply a predilection for planning. To recognize ordered relationships is one thing; to pretend to be able to alter them systemically is quite another.

6. Sufficiency: Justice and the Self

To speak more specifically of the norm of sufficiency, in fact, returns us home — to myself and to the community which gives me sustenance. Here it is helpful to recall an observation of Aristotle's in response to his own question: can one do injustice to oneself? Since he locates the specific character of justice in one's relations with others, he must answer *no*: I may harm myself, say, by overeating, yet I cannot (strictly speaking) be said to be doing myself an injustice. Yet the answer sounds too *systematic*, somehow, as anyone who cares for a chronic guzzler acutely feels. They want to insist: "finally, you're being unfair to yourself." Aristotle senses this as well, for he goes on to acknowledge that we can speak, albeit metaphorically, of justice to ourselves, in as much as we can legitimately think of parts of ourselves. He notes that the form of justice involved, however, will not be political, but will follow the relationships which obtain among the parts of me: it will resemble more the justice attendant upon master-slave relations, or that of a household, notably between wife and husband.[15]

These closing remarks of Aristotle's discussion of justice in the *Ethics* offer me a way of drawing this discussion to a very practical conclusion. His implicit reference is clearly to Plato's discussion of body and soul in the *Phaedo*, where the responsible agent only develops in the measure that the discerning principle (soul) directs the relatively fixed desires (body) to an acceptable goal: to form someone like Socrates. Without deprecating the force of Plato's analysis, we could put Aristotle's observations at the service of an even more expressly relational scheme of the self. We could extend his point (and in effect complete his own

treatment) by stipulating that we will only be able to make the judgments of proportional equity which justice requires in the measure that we have reconciled the conflicting demands within ourselves.[16]

The norm of justice cannot simply be another's need, for if that be the only measure each of us will be torn asunder responding to it — there are so many others! Yet the alternative does not need to move defensively to a preoccupation with my own needs. Between these extremes lies the norm of *sufficiency*, which attends to others' needs "from within." By the metaphorical phrase "from within," I mean out of a process of dealing with the needs that crop up within me — befriending, diverting, encouraging, arresting them — with a view towards forging a self neatly at the service of those goals embodied by the people whom I have come to admire.

7. Education for Justice

The struggle to reconcile the conflicting desires and needs which crop up within me deserves but one name: discipline. We quickly resent having others discipline us, and easily tire of disciplining ourselves, but we never outgrow either process. As adults we enter into or confirm relationships which make demands upon us tantamount to discipline — think how early most people in our country rise to get to work! And we have adopted goals for ourselves which require some strict priorities if they are to be achieved. In this generic sense, all education is education for justice, insofar as it apprentices us to a discipline. We come to appreciate the relative worth of things in the process — positively in a well-organized and substantive course, and by default in one which (we feel) emphasizes the wrong things. An educational process which is authentic — is not "Mickey Mouse" — lays the groundwork for discriminating proportional judgments by displaying and demanding them as we are led to learn something.

In this sense, any decent education is an education for justice. Yet the sense remains somewhat formal, turning on the discipline required to understand anything at all. The argument developed thus far laid particular stress on the interdependence of nations. Interdependence was said to be a fact, but an *economic* fact, often not readily apparent except upon analysis. This is especially true in the United States, where our size and favorable situation leads to an illusion (and sometimes a positive goal) of economic independence. We could say the same thing about need: it is there; people are there with needs which (given the fact of interdependence) will go unmet if we continue to live in our accustomed manner. Yet we may never come into sufficient contact with these people to feel the demand of their need on our surplus. Metaphorically speaking, as Aristotle would say, it would be like methodically repressing needs of our own. The whole self loses before long, as do others who must associate with us.

These observations suggest some explicit strategies for a more specific education for justice. They would involve both careful analysis and experiential involvement. The analysis would require closer scrutiny of relationships — social, political, and economic, as well as some explicitly critical reflection on the ways we have become accustomed to viewing these relationships — to bring in the expertise more native to philosophers and theologians. The courses in the curriculum which embody such analysis might profitably be team-taught, since the subjects considered are "mixed" — that is, they do not correspond very exactly to settled divisions between academic disciplines. They must focus on systemic understanding for the issues involve a multiplicity of elements, and reconciling these will demand a capacity to discern possible ways of *ordering* them. A close scrutiny of statistical argument in relation to a particular issue (as Richard Titmuss exhibits in *The Gift Relationship*) would help develop critical as well as discerning judgment.

The experiential involvement will probably need to involve for most some explicit form of "voluntary displacement."[17] Socio-economic boundaries are as firm as political boundaries, if not more so, as students have found after taking an "Urban Plunge" into hitherto unknown parts of their own city. Similarly, we often cannot appreciate just how bizarre are the ways we routinely spend time, energy, or money until we have allowed ourselves to live otherwise and come to feel the difference. In either case, to come face-to-face with people in need is to understand how our way of living can be called affluent. Then to connect this enlightening self-awareness with a studied appreciation of the connection between their need and our affluence is to trigger acute personal realizations with far-reaching social consequences. Some such impressionistic sketch might guide those concerned to develop programs in education for justice.

8. Indispensability of Community

A final word about education as it lies beyond any program, yet closer to home. Our society schools us to consume; if we are to realize a contrary discipline we will need to work to form a community. In fact, the disciplines of community are the very things from which consumer addiction promises to liberate us, just as it offers us a substitute for the regards of community: caring relationships with one another. In short, the consumer ethos offers an *ersatz* substitute for community; so much so that our ordinary need for community is intensified when we realize how the disciplines demanded by community can offer a healthy antidote to those very weaknesses which give consumerism power over us. For it will take the support of community consensus to help us break our long-established, culturally-ingrained habits of consumption. Moreover, "members of the community can help each other with decisions on the making and using of money."[18] Furthermore, "they can work together on matters of political

advocacy, seeking to translate to the larger society the values of cooperation and solidarity that they have found in their small community, engaging together in the critical thinking that must enter into policy positions and suffering together the attacks of those whose vested interests they may threaten."

9. A Political Afterword

There we have a distinctively populist vision. It is offered as an afterword, to flesh out the intensely personal point about justice, to offer an after-hours corollary to the remarks on education, and to offer a mini-step towards addressing the one dimension of the question I have been avoiding all along: the political. How can we manage that? Can we muddle along in our pseudo-democratic fashion, with certain interest groups disproportionately financed (to say the least), with citizens' lobbies collecting nickels and dimes to counter mammoth influence peddlers; or do we have to think about doing it the Chinese way? Obviously I can't even pose the question very well. I can only invite you to eschew such management schemes, and reactivate my populist vision. It is something one would only dare to do in America, whose distinctive political ideology remains populism, and where neighborhood organization continues to capture our imagination — despite canned television and the shopping center blight. The hope is that bigness and anonymity will prove so ugly and pointless that enough people in enough places will put forward enough effort to begin to experience the advantages intrinsic to a simpler communal life. "Coming gradually to terms with the meaning of suffering for themselves," members of such a community will "dare to take some risks for the sake of sufficiency for all the members of the one global community." That is, their experience of sharing life will offer some tangible sense to the unit base naively proffered for resource statistics, and they will hasten the future by anticipating it. At least they will have worked in a studied and deliberate manner *not* to contribute to the prevailing disorder, and thereby will have offered us all some taste of the order which we must at least contemplate if we are to go on.

David B. Burrell, C.S.C., is Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of Theology, at the University of Notre Dame.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a series of essays exploring this question, see W. Aiken and H. LaFollette (eds), *World Hunger and Moral Obligation* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1977).
2. Aristotle: *Nichomachean Ethics*, Bk. 5.
3. Hence I would take issue with William Frnakena, in his essay, "Some Beliefs about Justice," in Aiken and LaFollette, *op. cit.*, 47-51.
4. For an explication of shared human potential see Paul Streeten's "basic human needs" thesis for development in K. Jameson and C. Wilber; *New Directions in Economic Development* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1979), and David Norton, *Personal Destinies* (Princeton, N.J., 1976), Ch. 10: "Intrinsic Justice and Division of Labor."
5. Paul VI., *Populerum Progressio*, in Joseph Gremillion, *Gospel of Justice and Peace* (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1976) 386-416. For the basis of Paul's teaching cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 11-11, question 66, article 7, where he gives the classical formulation of the principle.
6. Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, State and Utopia* (N.Y., 1974).
7. This is the thesis of Christopher Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World* (New York, 1978). See his review of the Carnegie Council report in *New York Review of Books* (24 November 1977) 15-18.
8. Richard Barnet in *Sojourners* (February, 1976) pp. 17f: "Interview on Multinational Corporations."
9. Stanley Hauerwas reminded me that Adam Smith wrote first on moral philosophy and intended to rest his economics on the relationships so described. For a fascinating description of these underlying relationships, see Jane Jacobs, *Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York, 1961).
10. Albert Fritsch, *The Contrasumers: A Citizen's Guide to Resource Conservation* (New York, 1974), p. 23.
11. William Gibson, in Dieter Hessel (ed), *Beyond Survival: Bread and Justice in Christian Perspectives* (New York, 1977), p. 122.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 129.
13. Alasdair MacIntyre is busy reminding us how unfruitful it is to presume *rights* to be the basic socio-political notion. See his *Against the Self-Images of the Age* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1978).
14. E.F. Schumacher's observation that our resources are our capital (in *Small is Beautiful* (N.Y., 1973) makes its obvious point only when we realize them to be finite.
15. Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics*, Bk. 5, Ch. 11.
16. cf. Norton, *Personal Destinies*, 343-53.
17. See Henri Nouwen's development of this practice in *Sojourners* (December, 1977).
18. I am indebted to William Gibson (in *Beyond Survival*, pp. 136-40) for providing much of the formulation of this entire section.

TWO PILOT REPORTS

Villanova University

Owen R. Jackson, O.S.A. and
Daniel Regan

The early 1970's were years of increasing world wide famine and starvation for literally millions of people. Photos of infants with bloated bellies caused by malnutrition were commonplace. All across the Sahil region of Africa and throughout large portions of Asia food supplies were limited or non-existent. Many people in our own country were appalled at the plight of these hungry masses and asked not only what could be done to help them, but why did such conditions arise in the first place. It was in response to this "sign of the times" that the Peace and Justice Program at Villanova University owes its beginnings.

Initially, a University Senate resolution called upon the Villanova community to explore possible avenues of relief for the needs of the hungry, while, simultaneously, rethinking our role as educators *vis-a-vis* our concern or lack of concern about this global tragedy. The Social Action Committee was given the responsibility of developing consciousness-raising programs and fund raising activities. In cooperation with the Campus Ministry Office such events as Hunger Awareness Week and "Balloon Day" answered the first part of the Senate resolution. Further, some members of the faculty put together an Honors course entitled, "World Hunger Crisis." It was offered in the Spring of 1976 as a series of special lectures on the various dimensions of the hunger problem.

However, something more was needed. A breakthrough came at a May 1976 seminar in St. Louis sponsored by Bread for the World Educational Fund. This brainstorming session pulled together a number of interested parties on campus in order to discuss curriculum changes and provide ideas for people who were attempting to restructure courses and programs of study in a way that might address the hunger issue. It was obvious that many schools were trying to focus attention on global issues but were experiencing difficulties in finding the proper academic vehicle. The likelihood of starting a new department of studies on hunger was remote. The interdisciplinary nature of the hunger issue, called for interdepartmental cooperation — something not easily achieved. And, of course, hunger wasn't the only global problem. The arms race, militarism, poverty, etc. were all significant social problems requiring broad analysis.

Upon returning from the St. Louis conference we developed an action plan which we hoped would be both comprehensive and reasonable within the limited financial resources available. A proposal to create a Program of Studies in Peace and Justice was submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. It called for two interdisciplinary seminars, one to be an introductory course, the other to be an advanced, or capstone seminar. All other courses in the program would be offered through the various departments of the College of Arts and Sciences. This plan was especially appealing since a number of courses were already offered at Villanova which focused on justice and peace issues. With additional interdisciplinary input, and some added ethical reflections, courses such as "The Politics of Human Rights," "Latin American Society and Thought," and "Economics of Social Issues" fitted quite well into the new program. A surprising number of our faculty were more receptive to the proposal and there were no serious objections from any quarter. Within a few months' time approvals had been received from the Dean, the curriculum committee, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The blueprint was there; getting it off the drawing board promised to be somewhat more difficult.

The Introductory Course was initially conceived in terms of an interdisciplinary seminar covering a wide range of topics. We taught this way for one semester. Three professors were present for each class, but the presentation of material was mostly done by guest lecturers. While this proved interesting and informative, it clearly lacked cohesiveness. There was a definite need to find a way of interrelating the many global concerns dealt with in the course, and the ethical and value considerations so necessary for justice education.

The "pearl of great price" was discovered in an essay by Paul M. Dietterich entitled, "Some Dimensions of International Affairs Education." The article was one of a number of excellent writings compiled by Thomas Fenton

for the book, *Education for Justice* (Orbis, 1975). Dietterich's description of international affairs education fitted quite well into our understanding of peace and justice education. He called it a process through which students become open and empathetic to other peoples and cultures, develop skills for analyzing global social issues in an ethical context, and learn how to translate their concerns into effective political and social involvement.

This "Dietterich model" introductory course has served us quite well during the past two semesters. It is divided into four major units. 1) Inclusion, 2) Perception, 3) Values, and 4) Influence. The Inclusion unit discusses the prejudices and ethnocentric biases which affect the human condition. An attempt is made, through reading and discussion, to appreciate the uniqueness of each person and the splendid variety in humankind. A global village model and some developed game situations, together with parts of the filmstrip, *Global City,* published by the Peace and Justice Institute, St. Louis, Mo., comprise the Perception phase of the course. For many students there is a rude awakening to the gross maldistribution of resources on our planet. Sub-units within this section touch on the lessons of the Holocaust, world hunger, and the arms race.

The second half of the course addresses the Value and Influence concerns. What is a value? What are my values? — Can things be changed? How does change occur? These and similar questions are presented as central to the issues of peace and justice. Examining individual values through the clarifying techniques of Sidney Simon and others leads into the broader considerations of the ethical teachings of Jesus, Gandhi, etc. The social teachings of the Catholic Church as well as other religious bodies are explored for their evaluations of modern life. In the final quarter of the course a variety of organizations which act as agents for social change are examined. Common Cause, Fellowship of Reconciliation, and Bread for the World among them. Students are also encouraged to look at their own life style and make comparisons with other peoples of different political and economic backgrounds. In short, we are relatively satisfied with the introductory course as now taught. The need for many guest lecturers has been eliminated and a cohesive, broad understanding of justice education has been established. Paul Dietterich, we thank you!

Expanding the Program

Another dimension of the Peace and Justice Program centers around the question of "the future." Simply stated, how do we help our students become skilled in restructuring institutions of society in more just ways, and broadening their vision for a new and better world. Given the prevalent attitude of the university student of the seventies, this is not an easy task. The more volatile and socially active student of the sixties is no longer with us. That student has been replaced by a diligent, but less responsive, undergraduate who accurately mirrors the psychological perspective of today's society. At Villanova, therefore, we decided to cap the program of studies with a seminar designed to assist students in determining the probable and possible futures open to them in expressing their witness to the need of social justice and world peace. This futurology course is still in the planning stages and will not be offered until the Fall of 1979.

With regard to the other courses, efforts are now being made to expand the content and increase their numbers. For example, a course entitled "History of South American Cultures," previously taught by a member of the History Department is now taught in conjunction with a theologian knowledgeable in the area of Liberation Theology, and a sociologist whose expertise centers on low income social groups. An economics course on the "Economics of the Underdeveloped Countries" makes use of a political scientist who has researched the use of food as a political weapon. The list is much longer but, we hope, the point is clear. Namely, there are many standard courses which can be revised in interdisciplinary and value centered ways. It is hoped, too, that a course will develop that can involve students in the actual social and political activities which are at work in our society and around the globe. This course would allow for participation in a type of field experience. The Augustinian Order, which is the religious community affiliated with Villanova University, has a number of communities located in poverty areas in this country and world wide. Conversations are currently in progress with the expectation that an academically credible way might be found to offer students some first hand learning about Third World realities.

We have encouraged students to participate in meetings and seminars sponsored by groups such as Bread for the World and Pax Christi. These opportunities, and the courses themselves, help to stimulate one's reflective consciousness while in the program. Courses such as "The Third World Revolution," "Politics of Human Rights," "Religious Studies: Issues in Peace and Justice," "People and Politics of Japan and China," and "Philosophical Aspects of Criminal Justice" — as well as those already mentioned — serve as an excellent framework in which our students can design their programs: when their perspectives and values have been strengthened with the challenges of such material, it is imperative that they be given opportunities for particular expressions of social influence.

Any program of studies relies ultimately on the contributions and concern, the talents and the interest of its participating faculty. At a university the size of Villanova, there is no shortage of qualified, interested and interesting faculty. But the very size and diversity of the University brings with it, its own problems. Since Villanova has four separate schools: Commerce and Finance; Nursing; Engineering; and Arts and Sciences on the undergraduate level, and a graduate faculty in the areas of Engineering, Arts and Sciences, and Law, there is a great

deal of autonomy and in many respects anonymity within the ranks of a faculty numbering over four hundred.

The initial difficulty we faced was the problem of bringing to the forefront those qualified faculty who would be willing to participate in an interdisciplinary approach to the questions of peace and justice. Faculty are not immune to what may be termed "territorial jealousies." For reasons too varied to list many competent and well intentioned professionals simply do not wish to alter their pedigogical procedures. One has to know their faculty well in order to begin such a program.

The selection of a nucleus of faculty was not a random one. At the same time, no attempt was ever made to exclude any of our colleagues from this program of studies. Further, to awaken the reflective spirits in our community at Villanova, we began the Peace and Justice Faculty Club. The purpose of this club is to gather faculty members from every segment of the university once a month for a luncheon and an intellectual discussion on some topic of world peace and social justice. Invitations were sent to every member of the faculty in the University — from every college. A minimal fee was charged to identify those who were really interested. The results have been quite good.

Every luncheon — and we have held seven to date — has been attended by, at least, fifteen and by as many as thirty-four colleagues. There has resulted a flexible group of our colleagues — engineers, accountants, nurses, lawyers as well as members of the College of Arts and Sciences — that enjoys the opportunity to interact with colleagues who would otherwise have remained intellectual strangers. Consequently, it has been easier to involve members of the community in a number of important dialogues. The amount of faculty participation at meetings and seminars has improved. In addition to the luncheons, Villanova has also sponsored, in conjunction with the Augustinian Province, a summer workshop of its own. Reaching out to faculty in other colleges and universities, in June 1977 Villanova sponsored a three-day workshop for approximately 85 faculty members from other colleges. This helped create a network of interest among campuses. Other workshops in the future are anticipated as a part of our continuing efforts to develop the concepts of peace and social justice in the entire community.

Funding for all of the activities mentioned above remains a constant concern. Through the Office of Development we have made funding appeals to several corporations and some federal agencies to help underwrite the development of faculty and programs in the area of values education. There is no question that values education has become an attractive area to these possible sources of revenue. The age of moral relativism has produced a counter-attack of commitment to a truly human perspective. There is no consensus as to the particulars of any one value system, but the traditional understanding of the more universal values that underly the human situation has been loudly re-affirmed.

Horror at the waste of human life and resources in Northern Ireland, Lebanon, Nicaragua and Uganda crosses every religious group, every ethnic background. The folly of nuclear proliferation, the senselessness and basic inhumanity of neutron bombs and unbridled military spending in a world that houses millions of starving poor is clear to every political party, every economic ideology. An informed and self-reflective faculty is an absolutely essential ingredient for a successful academic campaign against the ignorance and indifference that is all too present at the educational institutions of America and around the globe. There appears to be a rising interest in the business community for the position that the fight against moral apathy should be supported.

A final point in this regard focuses on our hopes for the future. One area which we see developing is the expansion of faculty influence into the greater community which surrounds our campus. Villanova plans to offer a variety of workshops for local people interested in Peace/Justice issues. The education toward peace and social justice is not confined to college students alone. The need for intelligent, conscientious citizens has never been greater. Universities cannot be ivory towers; they must move actively to contribute to the development of an informed citizenry. We see the role of higher education in justice education as one of service to students and the local community. Furthermore, it should be noted that Catholic primary and secondary schools throughout the country have begun to incorporate justice education themes into their curriculum. While it is hardly likely that these types of programs will attract large numbers of students, it is reasonable to expect that some students will seek out schools which offer courses and programs of study which focus on peace and justice. Teachers, also, at grade and high school levels are beginning to seek training in these studies. It is important that higher education provide them the opportunities for retooling.

When once asked why she cared for the poor, Mother Teresa responded simply, "because they are there." The same type of response can be made in answering the question, "why do you have a peace and justice program?" It is abundantly clear that conditions in the modern world demand that we challenge students to examine their personal values and explore new and creative ways to work for solutions to the many global problems confronting us. At their May 1978 meeting in Chicago the National Conference of Catholic Bishops reaffirmed their desire to see Catholic schools participate in justice education. "We urge Catholic colleges and universities to develop degree programs in justice and peace education projects." Furthermore, they wrote: "the NCCB/USCC will invite scholars and universities to undertake serious research into issues of justice and peace." Peace and justice education is not a

frill added to the academic enterprise. Rather, for church related schools it must be seen as a core endeavor as we seek to build a new and better world.

Owen J. Jackson, OSA, is Campus Minister and Professor of Religious Studies. Daniel Regan is Assistant Professor, Philosophy, Villanova University.

University of Notre Dame: Spotlight on Business
What's Happening in the Business College?*

The College of Business Administration at the University of Notre Dame is energetically involved in issues of Justice, specifically where related to International Business, Business Ethics, Corporate Character and Decision Making Processes. The College is in the forefront of University curriculum development related to Justice, striving to express a keen sensitivity to Christian man in today's business environment.

We in the Business College are proud and grateful for the dynamic and innovative leadership of Bro. Leo V. Ryan, C.S.V. Brother Ryan's lifetime involvement and personal concern for Justice are amply documented by his accomplishments in both the public and private sectors. His encouragement and direction is in no small part a primary factor in the Business College's efforts to support Justice Education.

Recognition likewise is in order of a dedicated faculty whose endeavors to inculcate "student awareness" of Justice, reflect their own personal commitments to the ideals of a Notre Dame education. When preparing course syllabi, each Business faculty member indicates how he will address issues of Justice in each of his courses.

Business students, as well, play an integral part in the College's program for Justice Education. Many undergraduates participate in "Urban Plunge" or support University activities in Justice, either through the Business Clubs or Student Government. All graduate students participate in a third-semester Workshop Course on "Energy, Ecology, Equality and Ethics." Undergraduates avail themselves of courses on Business Ethics such as "Decision Making in the Christian Tradition."

Business College Working Committee for Justice Education

Aided by a strong, centralized faculty under the leadership of the College Dean, the Working Committee tackles a two-fold task: (1) Encourage and promote greater student awareness of Justice, and (2) Support faculty initiatives in this area.

Understandably, faculty involvement varies by individual. In addressing the question of Justice in a classroom setting, faculty members leave their specialized areas of "academic security" to step into the broader world of reality, a step taken with an obvious degree of apprehension. It is here that the Working Committee attempts to be a mechanism of moral support to each faculty member.

The Working Committee is informally structured into a "core committee" of three professors, two graduate students and two undergraduate students. Working behind-the-scenes, the Committee initiates supportive actions within the College itself. Its primary vehicle for policy implementation is the *Business Activities Club* made up of the individual student Department Club Presidents.

The Committee establishes personal contact with various faculty members and student club representatives to seek out input and feedback on ways to implement Justice awareness within the College. It operates as a communication vehicle, alerting students, faculty and staff to each other's activities, methods, required support, concerns, etc.

What then are the explicit Business College accomplishments and ongoing efforts in Justice Education at Notre Dame? The following listings are indicative:

Past Activities

1) This past summer graduate MBA students, on their own initiative, gathered with key faculty and staff members at a luncheon meeting. The participants discussed needs and tactics for curriculum modification to better enhance the inculcation of Ethics and Values.

2) A group of faculty and students participated in a series of joint seminars in support of the "Third World Film Festival."

3) The Business College held a faculty forum on ways to prepare and present Justice issues in the classroom setting

*One phase of Notre Dame's overall Education for Justice Program.

in support of last year's "Teach-In," a one-of-a-kind University activity.

4) As part of this year's Cardinal O'Hara lecture series, Sister Jane Scully (Board Member, Gulf Oil Corp.) addressed corporate morality specifically in the area of political "slush funds."

5) Currently, the Business College participates in a combined Philosophy/Theology/Business committee reviewing areas of Ethics and Morality. An outgrowth of this area was the recent conference on "Policies and Persons: Dilemmas in Corporate Decision Making," directed by Professors Goodpaster and Ruhe. Sponsored by the *Indiana Committee on the Humanities*, this innovative conference developed open, in-depth communication channels between academic experts and corporation executives on the trauma resulting from the clash of personal values and corporate goals.

6) Professor Lee Tavis guided a group of businessmen and faculty in a three-day conference addressing the question of "Multinational Corporations and Third World Poverty." As participants in an ongoing ten-month project, each individual identified an action area he or she will address for later follow-up review.

Upcoming Events

1) Professor John Houck and Father Oliver Williams, C.S.C., have co-authored a book entitled *Face Value*, an offshoot of their team-taught course on Christian Decision Making. Soon to be published, the book will be featured by *Fortune* magazine.

2) Business undergraduates are formulating plans to sponsor a "Business Evening" in late January on the question of business responsibility in the international sector. The program, part of an AISEC forum will consist of invited faculty speakers leading open-panel discussions on relevant topics.

3) Our Working Committee is pursuing avenues to produce greater participation of Business College faculty in next year's "Teach-In." Aided by written correspondence from Dean Ryan and direct faculty contacts, the Committee hopes to achieve a solid, two-day teaching effort in Justice Education.

By virtue of a solid tripod foundation of faculty, staff and students, the Business College attempts to bring about Justice Awareness within and without the College. Many examples, some of which are here mentioned, bear evidence to this attempt. While admitting that our approach has been informal and apparently haphazard, we prefer to view it as a series of steps in a long-run continuing effort. Constantly aiming for greater involvement in Justice issues, the Working Committee utilizes the present College intrastructure of faculty committees and student business clubs to attain its goals. Positive reinforcement of faculty efforts, combined with moral support from students and personal one-to-one communication among all, has made possible the success we have already achieved and bolsters our hopes for further future success.

RESOURCE LIST

Library Resources: Business-Related

New materials on business ethics and the special responsibility of business are regularly added to Memorial Library collections. Provided below is a list of several recent acquisitions. Additional books may be located by checking under the subject headings, *Business ethics* and *Industry — Social aspects,* in the main card catalog.

Abt, Clark C. *The Social Audit for Management.* New York: Amacom, 1977. C.L. HD 60 A27

Carroll, Archie B. (ed.). *Managing Corporate Social Responsibility.* Boston: Little Brown, 1977. C.L. HD 60.5 U5 M337

Jacoby, Neil H. *Bribery and Extortion in World Business: A Study of Corporate Political Payments Abroad.* New York: Macmillan, 1977. C.L. HV 6868 J3

Klein, Thomas A. *Social Costs and Benefits of Business.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977. HD 60 K56 1977

Kobrin, Stephen J. *Foreign Direct Investment, Industrialization, and Social Change.* Greenwich, Conn.: JAI HG 4538 K58

National Conference on Business Ethics. Bently College, Waltham, Mass. *Business Values and Social Justice: Compatibility or Contradiction?* Bently College, Center for Business Ethics, 1977. C.L. HF 5387 N3

Seidman, Ann and Neva. *South Africa and U.S. Multinational Corporations.* Westport, Conn.: Lawrence Hill, 1978. HD 2755.5 S4

Sethi, S. Prakash. *Up Against the Corporate Wall: Modern Corporations and Social Issues of the Seventies.* (3rd edition). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977. C.L. HD 60.5 U5 S47

Silk, Leonard S., and David Vogel. *Ethics and Profits: The Crisis of Confidence in American Business.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976. C.L. HD 60.5 U5 S54

Sturdivant, Frederick D., and Larry M. Robinson (eds.). *The Corporate Social Challenge: Cases and Commentaries.* Homewood, Ill.: R.D. Irwin, 1977. C.L. HD 60.5 U5 C688

Justice News, University of Notre Dame
Committee on Education for Justice
Volume III, No. 3
November 19, 1978

NOTES ON OTHER MODELS

Manhattan College

Joseph Fahey

In recent years many Catholic educators have increasingly turned their attention to including studies which deal with social justice and global peace into their curricula. In addition, significant numbers of religious communities (especially women) have mandated their members to pursue justice and peace in their various apostolates — especially teaching. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops — in response to the Call to Action proposals — have called for university programs in justice and peace studies. The Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities is taking the lead in challenging its members to develop programs in Education for Justice. A pre-collegial curriculum has been designed and published by the NCEA National Center for Education in Peace and Justice.

All of this is very hopeful. It is hopeful not only because our theologians and Scripture scholars are focusing much more on justice education in their work, but also because we are coming to realize that an education cannot be called truly Catholic unless it addresses itself to the great issues of justice and peace in our time. We are, after all, preparing our students for ministry in the world and there is almost no career which is not touched by justice and peace issues. There was a time when I wondered if all this was a "fad" which we were passing through but which would have no permanency. But the World Synod of Bishops (1971) gave strong support for justice education and stated that it was "constitutive" of the Gospel message. Let us hope that we are here to stay.

This article will describe one early attempt at a justice and peace education program at the undergraduate level. It should be emphasized that while this is a degree granting program there are many other ways to include justice and peace in our curricula and university ministry. A word will be said about those options presently.

The Manhattan College Experience

In 1966 a group of faculty and administrators formed the Pacem in Terris Institute at Manhattan College. The Institute's chief purpose was to promote peace education at various levels but especially at the college level. The first course that was taught was entitled "The Anatomy of Peace" (History) and it was taught by four teachers (because no single teacher had the expertise to conduct an entire course). This course was followed by courses in Religious Studies, Economics, Government and Philosophy. During this time the Institute also sponsored seminars and workshops on education for peace and also dealt with specific issues such as the United Nations, social justice, and conflict resolution.

In 1970 a student then petitioned the faculty for a major in Peace Studies. After careful study and planning the College sought approval from the New York State Education Department to grant a B.A. in Peace Studies. The program was to be of a multidisciplinary nature and represented a new thrust called "problem centered" education (as distinct from traditional discipline-oriented education). The State gave approval and in 1971 a B.A. program was begun.

Much development has taken place in the program since 1971. Thirty credits are required for the major and the requirements are divided as follows:

1) Introductory Seminar on Peace and Social Justice (3 credits for all new majors, minors, or interested students)

2) Multidisciplinary course work from the following typical courses:

- Biology of Human Behavior
- The Economics of Peace
- War, Peace and the Arts
- International Organizations
- The Anatomy of Peace
- Philosophies of War and Peace
- The Psychology of Social Problems
- Religious Dimensions of Peace
- Nonviolent Revolution
- Social Problems Seminar
- The Literature of the Great War
- Conflict Management

In addition, there are some fourteen other courses which are acceptable for major (the minor is 15 credits). Each of these courses is available to Peace Studies students but the

bulk of the students in them are students who are pursuing degrees in other fields and thus many other students are exposed to justice and peace concerns (almost 1,000 each year).

3) Field Work (three to six credits). Students work at such organizations as the United Nations, the American Arbitration Association, the American Friends Service Committee, the World Without War Council, and Covenant House (to name a few). They also work in the South Bronx, in teaching, and one has even done conflict work with the New York City Police Department.

4) Senior Seminar (three credits). This final seminar is designed to integrate the student's course of studies and the field work done into a unified academic experience.

To date, the graduates have become involved in graduate studies (government, law, religion, etc.), some work at the United Nations, with the American Arbitration Association, in teaching, and in social work. The critics of the program predicted it would not last five years. The program is still thriving. In addition, the course of study has had a very positive impact on the entire college and many students and faculty have expressed appreciation for its presence on campus. The College administration has also been exceptionally supportive of the Peace Studies program. Further information can be obtained from: Br. James Collins, FSA, Director, Peace Studies Institute, Manhattan College, Bronx, New York 10471.

Joseph Fahey is the former Director of the Peace Studies Institute at Manhattan College and is presently the Director of the Center for Social Progress at Sacred Heart University.

Loyola Marymount University

Suzanne DeBenedittis

Concern for social justice is a distinguishing characteristic of the present president of Loyola Marymount University and a significant number of faculty, staff and students. The campus, however, is far from utopian, for at the other extreme there are those for whom social justice is an alien abstraction far removed from their Gospel.

Sensitively scanning the signs of the times and noting the need that social justice be made an operational reality and not merely a subject for study, President Merrifield inaugurated the University Committee for Social Concerns in 1973.* By the end of that school year the committee, composed of faculty, staff and students (equally represented and chosen from among those expressly interested in social justice), became and has remained one of the most active committees on campus.

Serving in an advisory capacity to the President, the Social Concerns Committee made the following recommendations that year:

1. that an ethics course be made a general education requirement;
2. that field work options be made available in courses;
3. that a faculty values education in-service be provided; and
4. that the University be actively involved in the Catholic Bishops' bicentennial "Call to Action."

All of the recommendations were well received, and except for the third, all have been realized.

In the academic year 1974-75, the Social Concerns Committee did an extensive study and proposed that a comprehensive social ethics course which it had designed be made the requirement. This course would include areas integral to the development of moral maturity, such as moral philosophy, social/moral psychology, political science and the like. Although the proposal was not put into effect, its aims, in phoenix-like fashion, keep recurring and will be eventually realized. Another proposal submitted that year which was sent back for further clarity and specificity (and is presently being worked on) was the request for mini-sabbaticals in social justice. The aim of this proposal is to enable faculty to go live and work among the deprived and to gather resources, so that as educators we would be modeling or practicing what we are preaching and our words would not be wooden but rather, enlivened by actual experience.

Proposals which found acceptance that year included a description of the ideal LMU graduate which serves as a focal point for student development. The description is intended to identify certain qualities which the University has as goals for our graduates. To quote Thomas Quinlan, then Vice President for Student Affairs:

> *One of these qualities (which LMU strives to develop in its students) is an increased social consciousness which has practical manifesta-*

*The University Committee for Social Concerns, also known as the Social Concerns Committee, was originally titled the Commission on Higher Education and Social Concern.

tions in the way one lives, makes decisions, relates to others. A second value is the diminishing of the provincialism which leads to bias and suspicion of those different from ourselves. Third would be the continued development of a kind of intellectual curiosity and commitment to the life of the mind which will enable the individual to contribute to and partake of the larger society.[1]

That year the EPIC Proposal was also accepted. Educational Participation in Communities (EPIC) has shown itself to be an effective effort whereby the University, through the students, shares its skills with the community. To quote from the original proposal:

> *Inherent in the EPIC philosophy is the belief that education is effective in direct relation to the student's real involvement in the subject matter. Work through EPIC agencies can demonstrate the relationship between classroom instruction and its application to all that exists within the community.*
>
> *Through EPIC, students and faculty are trained and placed in various community agencies where their skills and talents are important to the function and sometimes the survival of those agencies.*
>
> *Using the resources of faculty, students and professionals, EPIC serves in the areas of unemployment, education, health, housing, delinquency and drug prevention, community organizing and other service agencies within the community*[2]

To assure the acceptance of the EPIC proposal, the Social Concerns Committee conducted a field-work survey which successfully demonstrated the interest in and need for EPIC. The Committee also recommended means to heighten the political consciousness of the entire student body and to encourage the use of their voting rights.

During the year 1976-77, studies were made and recommendations given regarding: (1) the University's investment portfolio and (2) a leadership program. Regarding the investment portfolio, Dr. Frank Wagner, a Professor of Business Administration, undertook the task of examination and subsequent advisement. Since most of Loyola Marymount's investments are with socially responsible or morally neutral corporations, Wagner is presently devising a plan of positive reinforcement for the socially responsive corporations to encourage keeping them so by citing them and sending commendations and by providing other social incentives. It is important to note that the Board of Trustees officially accepted the recommendation of Social Concerns Committee about socially responsible investments and agreed to a procedure for periodic review of the investment portfolio.

The Leadership Program proposes to train interested and capable students to become leaders in social justice. Presenting a holistic approach to justice education, the program includes cognitive, affective and behavioral components. The students involved would live together for one year to experience community support in their social action projects and to work through the nitty-gritty justice issues emerging in everyday life. In addition to taking the requirements for their respective majors, the students would be required to take one course each semester which would be developed specifically to teach the whys and hows of social justice and responsible leadership. The group would be involved in field work as an extension of these required courses, which would serve as an arena to test theory in praxis. Periodically the group would make retreats together to reflect on the entire process and to gain spiritual nourishment. Presently the Leadership Program exists in proposal form only, for its comprehensive scope has called for extensive revisions. It is among the goals on the 1978-79 Social Concerns Committee agenda to have a tightly written, extremely specific, economically solvent and administratively acceptable revision of this proposal submitted to the University President.[3]

The 1976-77 year closed with a highly successful Human Relations Workshop which was attended by over 100 interested faculty, staff and students. Several working groups grew out of the Workshop to pursue the need for a values education course and to deal with the issues of sexism and racism on the campus. The simulations and other experiences provided at the Human Relations Workshop helped all come to recognize stereotypes and the negative behavior which emanates therefrom. Both enjoyable and quite successful in achieving their goal of heightening and sensitizing our consciousnesses these activities have become an effective part of LMU's annual orientation program for incoming students.

The 1977-78 year found the committee rewriting a number of the former proposals, such as the Leadership Program and the Mini-sabbaticals for Social Justice. In addition to these reviews and revisions, the committee explored the possibility of establishing a Visiting Chair in Social Ethics to attract key people and scholars in social justice to come share their expertise with *both* faculty and students. The visiting professor would teach not only regular college courses, but would also provide faculty in-services and work closely with those professors seeking to enhance their course offerings with a social justice dimension. At periodic intervals public lecturers would bring his/her expertise to the community at large.

The goals for 1978-79 include the aforementioned redrafting of the leadership program proposal. The Social Concerns Committee is also examining the simmering unrest and cries of discrimination coming from Black, Gay, and Chicano groups respectively. The Committee's hope is to be able to propose socially just solutions to their ex-

pressed concerns. A proposal for an ethnocentrism course having both cognitive and affective components is also under study. The intent of such a course is to sensitize the white majority to the inhumanity that accompanies indifference and ignorance, while concomitantly paving the way for courage and compassion. The course would be required of all. At present courses that deal with these issues seem to be assiduously avoided by those most in need of such understanding.

Thus, one of our major goals must be to build wider community support for the programs already in operation and try for a faculty/student involvement which will match the presidential leadership we have witnessed.

Suzanne M. DeBenedittis, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor, Religious Social Ethics at Loyola Marymount University.

FOOTNOTES

1. Thomas E. Quinlan, Memorandum to Members of the University Commission on Higher Education and Social Concern (May 8, 1975). A full description of the ideal LMU graduate reads: "Considered in the light of social concern, the ideal graduate of LMU demonstrates two capabilities: *awareness* of the moral and ethical repercussions of his day-to-day choices and actions which is brought to fruition in a *commitment* to work for justice. The graduate's awareness is a moral one because of the Christian, and specifically Catholic, character of the University; and it is an ethical one because of the strong humanist education provided across all six schools that comprise LMU. Awareness is generated by constant reflection on experience. The University teaches the need for reflection, and the resulting awareness has a two-fold dimension: self-knowledge and a concern for the other. Knowledge of self provides a secure center from which the graduate reaches out to serve humankind. Enlightened by this awareness and propelled outward by its dynamic, the graduate's concern manifests itself in a striving for justice for all men and women. Only by a continuous interplay in our graduates between sensitive *awareness* which arouses concern and a *commitment* to its actualization does the educational process near its goal: the development of men and women devoted to living their lives for others."

2. *EPIC Proposal,* March 1975, p. 1. For the full five-page proposal and survey, or for the descriptive brochure that is presently used to advertise EPIC to our student body, write to Dr. Tom Wilson, LMU Student Development Center, Loyola Boulevard at W. 80th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90045.

3. Copies of the Leadership Program proposals can be obtained from Dr. Tom Wilson also.

FACE TO THE FUTURE

A New Educational Venture: Global Studies; Transactions with the Third World

Don E. Post

The Rationale

During the course of Spring graduation exercises have you found yourself wondering, with some degree of anxiety, what your university is about to turn loose on society? Or, in a more positive fashion, what impact will these graduates have on shaping the future of this nation and world? On such an occasion several years ago I had an especially disturbing experience. Prior to the "grand march" at commencement I was visiting with a graduate about his immediate plans. He was excited that his parents were taking him with them on a trip to Iran. I surmised as to how exciting that was going to be and pressed for more facts about the trip. I don't recall the details of the trip because I got "hung up," as they say, when he geographically located Iran in the vicinity of Argentina! There was no opportunity to pursue a lesson in basic Third World geography because friends and family were tugging at his sleeve and mine. I spent the remainder of that day in a state of "ultimate concern."

Now, it may be possible to forgive this lad his error in geography in view of the graduation day excitement (I am being very kind at this point). He may have had a brief lapse of memory (I hope!). Yet, having discussed this graduation day event with colleagues from other campuses it seems that such global ignorance is fairly common and exemplifies a general provincial posture in American higher education. In our academic process we produce persons for, at best, a national job market. I suspect that even the most idealistic "liberal arts" curriculum would fit this label or characterization. However, our concern is with Catholic higher education in America and our "omission" in shaping graduates *with* a global mentality and *for* trans-national leadership is particularly painful. The Church is trans-national; the *Faith* is trans-national. Thus, our educational "mission" is global, is it not? But let me back-off and argue the case for global studies from the secular view. I believe this will further strengthen my argument when applied to the religious sector.

I would press the need to provide every college student in America with a general geographical and socio-cultural orientation to what is generally labeled the Third World (Asia, Africa, Latin America) because it is in our self-interest to do so. This would, or should, complement the traditional western orientation of our contemporary educational processes. I would quickly agree with my colleagues who teach western philosophy and history when they argue that the average college graduate is significantly ignorant of that material, but it seems to me beyond debate that our "weltenshauung," or world view, is significantly different than that which operates and shapes life in most areas of the Third World. This is not the place to argue various models of analysis and/or conceptualization of this phenomena, only to suggest that there is an historical differentiation between the northern and southern hemispheres of this globe which is generally not being addressed in our educational system. Yet, through various wars (Korea, Nam) and critical national needs historically met by Third World nations (oil, lumber, etc.) the average citizen is becoming relatively more aware of these people. In fact, though our "average citizen" is not aware of the incredible "interdependence" of all nations he (or she) is increasingly aware of the constant impact of Third World countries on his/her pocketbooks, politics, and yes, even religion (note the influx of gurus, Mr. Moon and other such types, the Hari Krishna, and so forth). Increasingly one can find people talking about the relationship between the price of coffee and the events in Colombia or the ramifications of the Panama Canal treaty on U.S. relations in Latin America, to name a few issues. Many recognize that our country's future leadership role is dependent upon our understanding the needs of Third World peoples.

Without belaboring the issue the problem revolves around the "average citizen's" inability to deal with the World in the present tense, much less the future. Marshall McLuhan aptly describes such failure to perceive and act out of the way things are or will be as "looking through a rear view mirror." Where will our citizens get new "under-

standings?" Who will provide them? Where are the future shapers coming from?

Further, many U.S. citizens are presently engaged directly or indirectly in the socio-political life of the Third World nations as teachers, missionaries, business entrepreneurs, federal personnel, and so forth. There is evidence that much of this involvement could have been more productive for all concerned if those doing the acting had been better prepared educationally. Ethnocentric and paternalistic beliefs have been consistent and notorious impediments to cross-cultural communication and cooperation. These two ugly beasts, ethnocentrism and paternalism, are the enemies of future global unity and a more human community. Thus, there is an urgent need to develop a new generation of college graduates keenly attuned to the phenomenology of the Third World; the emerging global crisis where old social, economic, political, and ecological discontinuities, can and will no longer be tolerated because of the increasing realities of Third World power and global interdependence. The language of "mine" and "thine" must give way to more unifying notions. The bottom line on this whole argument is that we can not afford to continue to produce college graduates lacking a global perspective.

Now, when the need to shape leadership for the future is discussed in this context what does it mean for our Catholic colleges and universities? Obviously we believe that the Christian Faith provides Catholic educational institutions with "an edge" in shaping the minds of our citizens. This edge revolves around a deep commitment to help persons realize their full human potential by wedding knowledge and activity in the market place to such values as reconciliation, peace, love, justice, freedom from fear, and so forth.

General Goals of the Global Studies Program

There are a number of schools grappling with the need to raise up a new generation of global thinkers. Notre Dame's Fr. Don McNeill has directed a team of students in Peru for several years; Dr. Wayne Bragg has developed the *Human Needs and Global Resources* program at Wheaton College and had fourteen students in Africa and Latin America during 1978; Goshen College in Indiana is operated by the Menonites and every student spends at least a semester in a Third World nation. Many of the faculty at St. Edward's have caught this vision and have been trying to put a viable program together. The work of these people, and others, and the progress of their programs is encouraging.

The initial task was to design a curriculum that would not compete with our other majors and would utilize existing courses, with the ultimate goal being to add a global perspective to every graduate. Thus, if a graduate returns to a small south Texas town to help run the family ranch he will, hopefully, act out his life a wiser voter, community leader, father, and so forth. If the graduate chooses a career at the trans-national level he, or she, will be less paternalistic and ethnocentric than other such operators in the past. Again, hopefully! Most important, it was my strong belief that we should not be intent in producing "experts" or "change agents," as marvelous and ideal as that may appear. The goal has been more modest: to graduate students who understand something of the nature of global interdependence; especially sensitized to the phenomenology of Third World people.

Second, in conceptualizing the original design I believed that the St. Edward's faculty could provide the necessary classroom experiences. However, as an anthropoligist and having had past experiences with student cross-cultural living experiences, I felt there was a necessity for at least a semester-long internship in a Third World setting.

Third, following on the heels of the initial modeling, was my belief that all the Holy Cross Universities (Portland, St. Edward's, and Notre Dame) should cooperate in the foreign internship program. I assumed that all these institutions shared common commitments to global justice and a more loving world. The Dean provided funds for an initial consortium planning session on the St. Edward's campus in the Spring, 1978, which brought together Fr. Don McNeill, C.S.C., (Notre Dame), Dr. Gordon Schloming (University of Portland), and myself. This meeting is important to report because the program description that follows is a result of our joint thinking.

Program Objectives

The several objectives of the program are as follows:

A. To provide a basic orientation to the geographical and socio-cultural features of Third World nations in Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

B. To increase awareness of the complexities of global inter-dependence by:

1. Raising consciousness concerning various strategies to overcome the inequities of global resource distribution.
2. Providing a working-living experience in a Third World nation.
3. To develop workshops for faculty in the Third World which include an experiential component so they may be more aware of global issues in their teaching as well as in their supervising student interns.

C. To develop students before and after graduation prepared to:

1. See the international dimensions within their chosen career and profession.
2. Challenge the university community and local community to see the connections between local, national, and global issues of justice and peace.
3. Be responsibly involved in political issues as a global citizen.

Admission Procedures and Basic Curriculum

The Global studies program has been designed for juniors and seniors of all majors; therefore the recruitment takes place during the freshman-sophomore years. During our "consortium planning conference," referred to earlier, we agreed that each Holy Cross university could work out its own "in house" curriculum. Thus, at St. Edward's we constructed the following:

I. Completion of 45-60 hours should indicate that:

1) the student has mastered basic communication skills and

2) has a defined major and has taken some basic courses which provide a conceptual orientation to global issues.

II. Global Studies Required Core:

a. Third World History ..... 9 hrs.
(Asian, African, Latin American)
b. Cultural Anthropology ..... 3 hrs.
c. Third World Seminar, Junior Level ..... 6 hrs.

18 hrs.

III. Conversational ability in a foreign language compatible with a student's future choice for an internship position or life goals.

IV. Recommended courses:

Mexico: 1810 to present
Middle Eastern history
Politics of oil
Problems in American foreign policy
Social theory
Sociology of development
Literature of the Third World
Environmental Studies
International finance
Contemporary economic systems
International marketing
Ethics
History of philosophy
Religious studies

V. Third World Seminar:

The seminar is designed to heighten student consciousness regarding current and future global issues, especially those issues characterizing relationships between the "industrial" and Third World nations. The seminar is divided into two semesters with the content treated in a modular fashion under the supervision of competent specialists.

The Internship Program

Rationale

The need for a semester-long work/study experience in a Third World setting cannot be over-stressed. Our students do not need further exposure to the industrial, or post-industrial, sectors of the world, for that is where "they are coming from," as the street saying goes. The *do* need an exposure to cultures of the Third World in order to get some degree of "feel" or a "heightened consciousness" for how life is acted out and how the northern hemisphere nations and peoples are viewed from that vantage point.

Selection Process:

We recognize that all students will not be capable of coping with an intensive work-study semester. Further, we identified a number of possible internship locations that vary in their demands upon personal and inter-personal skills. To help aleviate potential problems we believe it necessary to seek the following information about any student seeking an internship: (1) recommendations from professors and others who might provide insights as to the student's maturity; (2) the student's ability to function in the language of the host country; (3) a proven ability to study independently and an introductory knowledge of basic Third World issues; (4) past experiences in internship type programs, with a belief that such prior experience will be excellent preparation for a foreign stint.

I should add that during our consortium planning session we agreed that U.S. internships should be provided as alternatives for those rejected for the Third World program. (We surely do not want to send "problems" to our friends in the South.)

The Setting

Our intent is to place a student in a work setting compatible with his/her major, a student majoring in education in a teaching environment, a business student in a business setting, and so forth. Second, this student would be sent "alone" in order to minimize the opportunity for retreating into a North American enclave. It generally follows that a group of students from the same culture tend to form a convenient clique and, thus, reduce their individual integration into the local cultural scene. This is a fairly normal characteristic and functions to protect one from the trauma of cross-cultural coping. Third, the student will be attached to a "host," or a national who agrees to play the roles of teacher and broker of the local scene.

In the initial stages of conceptualizing the program there was some skepticism regarding the willingness of Third World citizens to participate in an internship program. In order to test this notion I spent twelve weeks traveling throughout Latin America (with the exception of Uruguay) talking with anyone who would listen. The response was overwhelming! I returned with ninety-two different intern possibilities, and many of these were contacts that could spawn numerous positions. They ran the gamut from working in IBM in Guatemala City, a museum in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, a hospital in La Paz, Bolivia, and teaching in any of the scores of American schools which operate throughout Latin America. (Our Texas Education Agency will not allow student teachers credit for their practice semester outside an accredited school.) In each case I

explained to the prospective hosts that although the student would come possessing some skills that might be helpful in their operation, the real challenge would come in what they could teach the student. The student posture would be one of ignorance. To say the least, the people I talked with in Latin America, so used to Americans from the North with all the answers, were intrigued by the idea that they would be able to shape the minds of these "gringos."

It was further explained to the hosts that they would be responsible for helping find room and board for the student, although the student would pay the bill. Further, the host would work with the student and St. Edward's faculty in setting up the work contract, supervise the work, and prepare an evaluation of the student's performance at the end. (We ideally hope to be able to send a faculty member during mid-semester for an on-site evaluation.)

Meanwhile, the student works out a *learning contract* at his/her home university, which may include a maximum of twelve credit hours. For example, if a student wants to earn three hours in economics while in Chile, then he/she sits down with an economics professor and drafts the goals, objectives, means to reach the objectives, and designs evaluation procedures. The student is asked to maintain a daily journal of events, feelings, and so forth, plus write a final paper that reflects on the total experience in relation to basic global issues. Lastly, the student intern is expected to participate in the global studies seminar upon his/her return.

Faculty Preparation

We recognized that it is not sufficient to train students without providing faculty with an opportunity to review their courses in the light of Third World issues. Thus, we hope to set up a six-week faculty seminar in Latin America during the summer of 1979. This experience will hopefully lead to some significant revisions of our traditional curriculum and lead toward a more globally oriented university system.

Present State of the Program

Our first two students were sent out during the summer of 1978. One student, whose major is linguistics and eventually plans to teach, went to San Jose, Costa Rica and worked in a language facility. Another, whose major is in bilingual education, went to Bogota, Colombia, and worked in a publishing house. The publishing company in Bogota is currently working on a series of bi-lingual/bi-cultural textbooks for use in educating Mexican-Americans in the Southwestern areas of the United States. Both came home so infected with the excitement of their internship that they are trying to talk everyone they meet into going down. To say the least, they are very evangelistic! Their lives will never be the same, for they will never be able to ignore or take lightly issues of global dimension.

The Future

It must be evident to the reader that we are in the embryonic stage in developing this program. We face several crucial problems. First, not all students are going to clamor for a living-working experience in Latin America, Asia, or Africa. Yet, we can still provide for those who do and redesign our traditional curriculum to reflect global-Third World concerns. Second, our students cannot fund the internship semester alone. If we are unable to locate the funds to make the cost manageable it will not "float." Yet we are determined to continue urging ourselves and our colleagues in Catholic colleges and universities to devise ways of creatively meeting the future demands.

Dr. Don E. Post is Associate Professor of Anthropology/Sociology at St. Edward's University, Austin, Texas.

Sacred Heart University

Joseph Fahey

Sacred Heart University in Bridgeport, Connecticut, in response to the many calls for graduate work in justice and peace studies, began in the Fall of 1978 the Center for Social Progress whose main work is to begin an M.A. in Religious Studies with a concentration on justice and peace concerns. The establishment of the Center, supported by Maryknoll as well as by the University, represents a great breakthrough since it will enable us at last to prepare teachers, diocesan priests and religious as justice and peace workers professionally for their ministries. It will also stimulate the much needed research necessary to enable justice and peace studies to have a lasting impact on our Church and society.

Its structure is similar to the Manhattan College B.A. with the important exception that while the Manhattan degree is purely a multidisciplinary program, the M.A. at

Sacred Heart is centrally in the field of Religious Studies. Thirty-six credits are required for the M.A. The proposed structure and the courses for the program (which begins in January, 1979) are as follows:

1. Introductory Seminar on Justice and Peace
2. Course Work

a. Scripture: Old and New Testament justice and peace concerns;

b. Christian History: justice and peace in the early Church, in religious orders, in contemporary Catholic and Protestant movements;

c. Contemporary Religious Concerns: Ghandi and King, theologies of liberation, Eastern religions, spirituality, religious education;

d. Multidisciplinary courses: nonviolent theory, a human world order, community organization, the arms race; economics, psychology, and sociology, and anthropology of justice and peace

3. Practicum (six credits)

Domestic and overseas (through the Maryknoll Fathers), service in justice and peace offices, education and community social service

4. Final Seminar

Integration of Biblical and theological studies, Practicum and research . . .

The Center for Social Progress will also conduct workshops for teachers and others on justice and peace issues and will attempt to serve as a resource center for material dealing with justice and peace issues. (Further information can be obtained by writing: Center for Social Progress, Sacred Heart University, Bridgeport, CT 06606.)

While this program is of a degree nature it should be stressed that there are many other options for introducing justice and peace education into the Catholic campus. Some smaller campuses simply cannot contemplate degree programs but they can host lectures, conferences, and introduce individual courses and seminars (or even a minor) in justice and peace education.

Today our world is festering with the sores of social injustice, the arms race, institutional violence, poverty, racism, and community powerlessness. Our Catholic colleges and universities are beginning to establish justice and peace programs in response to these great problems. This is an educational task that lies at the very heart of Catholic education and the day must come when every Catholic college and university will be known for its justice and peace work. In the final analysis, we are not just rearranging our educational priorities, or addressing ourselves to specific justice and peace issues; we are in essence seeking to create a new global culture which is based on truly Christian and humanistic concerns. The Center for Social Progress hopes to continue that effort.

Joseph Fahey is the former Director of the Peace Studies Institute at Manhattan College and is presently the Director of the Center for Social Progress at Sacred Heart University.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Proposal — For the Executive Committee from the Task Force on Justice Education

Submitted for Executive Committee Meeting, February 9, 1977

Preamble:

Authoritative voices in the Church have with mounting urgency called us all to justice, liberation and the humanization of life. Everywhere, even in the secular world, it is recognized that this demands an *education for justice.*

A proper response to the Church's invitation in Vatican II to read "the Signs of the Times" would engage us in exploring the concern manifested everywhere that education, while remaining faithful to its traditional task of handing on and advancing the human heritage, (i.e. arts, sciences, culture — and in the Catholic schools the divine gift of the faith) must contribute more directly and explicitly to the transformation of structures of injustice and to the critical review of dehumanizing institutions which affect all sectors of life: social, economic, cultural and political.

Vatican II strongly supported the arts and sciences and defended their autonomy. It agreed that "the new humanism" has "an eminent place in an integral vocation." But Vatican II stressed even more strongly that integral to our vocation (above all that of communion with a transcendental Lord of History) is also to be "artisans of a new humanity" and to recognize that "all temporal activity continues the earthly task of the Saviour." Specifically, we are to engage therefore in "work to overcome . . . disease, famine, pollution . . . and to change the structures . . . flawed by . . . sin." (*Gaudium et Spes,* Chapter II, Passion)

Nothing equals the explicitness of *Justice in the World,* produced by the 1971 synod of bishops. "Action on behalf of justice and participation in the transformation of the world fully appear to us as a constitutive dimension of the preaching of the Gospel, or, in other words, of the Church's mission for the redemption of the human race and its liberation from every oppressive situation." This, the synod goes on, calls for an education that "teaches to live our lives . . . in accord with . . . personal and social morality . . ." Education therefore must bring "renewal of heart" and prepare for "a critical sense" and challenge "the society in which we live and its values."

In this line stands firmly the U.S. Bishops' Bicentennial "Call to Action." In the culminating assembly of *Liberty and Justice For All,* held in Detroit, October, 1976, the delegates with near unanimity called upon Catholic educators "in the name of the mandate for justice" to produce an education for justice "which touches a Christian in all aspects of life while placing every sector of society under judgment of the Gospel." This led the 1338 delegates further to a call on the NCEA, however roundabout its phrasing:

"That the office of International Justice and Peace and the Department of Education of USCC begin immediately to build on and support present efforts (USCC, NCEA, etc.) to develop new models of justice education at all levels."

This Task Force makes these voices its own. We feel they are signs of an emerging consensus and commitment from different groups in the Church.

We support the pursuit of academic excellence in the fields traditionally maintained in our colleges and universities. But, if action for justice be constitutive to the living out of the gospel, then our academic communities must be supportive of that justice.

We are therefore convinced that this emerging consensus provides Catholic colleges and universities with a privileged moment in which to move to a renewed and truly creative Christian identity.

WE THEREFORE RECOMMEND:

I. A Call to Process

That the *Association should call all its member institutions,* through the leadership of their presidents and deans, to embark on a process of self examination and self-definition, with the purpose of clarifying the means by which the goal of education for justice can permeate their entire educational mission. Such examination should concern curriculum, methods of instruction, structures of the institution, community relations and campus ministry.

The engagement of the faculty in such a process is of central importance, so initial efforts should begin with faculty development programs (e.g. summer workshops, seminars, forums, retreats) designed to generate serious discussion, concern and conviction among faculty about the opportunity and challenge which the present situation has opened up.

Participation by administration and staff (including development officers), trustees, students, and alumni/ae is also important. Though such a process might initially be an internal matter for the college or university community, it would also benefit from participation by members of local community action groups, ecumenical collaboration and interaction with educators concerned with justice education, by persons who experience the effects of injustice, by coalition building with other colleges, universities, etc., and by involving representatives of groups already engaged in programs of education for justice such as Bread for the World and the Campaign for Human Development.

Decisions about the precise design of such a process will, of course, have to be made in accord with the needs and history of the particular institutions involved. However, the NCEA should urge that this process be carefully and critically evaluated so that it can be shared with other institutions.

II. Consultants and Facilitators

The *Association should develop teams of persons* trained to put their skills in the area of justice education at the disposal of member institutions. Such teams would be available as consultants and facilitators for member institutions engaged in a process of self-examination, self-definition and evaluation described in number I above. Funding for the training of such teams should be sought to enable NCEA to begin providing assistance to member institutions in the Fall of 1977.

III. Communication System

The *Association should facilitate communication* among member institutions to enable them to share information about efforts being made to develop such an on-going process of self-definition as well as to share models developed for justice education. A network of member institutions might thus be designed to give maximum support to one another in this task.

IV. Evaluation Assistance

The *Association should collaborate* with other groups to develop means for providing member institutions with assistance in evaluating their efforts to respond to this call in the ways suggested above.

CONCLUSION

In short, the Task Force recommends that the Association both call its members to a creative response to the American Catholic community's Call to Action in the area of justice education and provide appropriate national and regional support for such a response.

Through this kind of mutual encouragement and collaboration, our colleges and universities will move most effectively and quickly to assume their particular part in the general task of the Catholic community as assigned by the *Humankind* recommendation #1:

> *". . . to develop new models of justice education at all levels . . . and stimulate research and evaluation in regions throughout the country (e.g. Catholic educational institutions, universities, etc.) . . . invite all scholars to participate in the ministry of justice and peace by collaborative research into questions of global justice . . . establishing and supporting Catholic centers for research on global justice . . . etc."*

Appendix B

Pilot Projects — Education for Justice

NOTRE DAME
Sponsor: C.S.C.
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
#Students: 6700 undergrad., 1200 graduate (coed)
Coordinator P/J: Ken Jamieson

Major thrust toward coordination of the many diverse programs already going on. Well organized committee with representation from students, faculty, administration and most of the schools in the University. Five subcommittees dealing with: Education for Justice (curriculum); Experiential Education (local urban areas and Latin America); Administrative Liaison (efforts to secure a Chair for Visiting Faculty on Justice/Peace); Communications (newsletter); and Justice at Notre Dame (on campus issues).

ST. MARY-OF-THE-WOODS
Sponsor: S.P.
Terra Haute, Indiana 47876
#Students: 496 (women)
Coordinator P/J: Ellen Cunningham, SP

Main efforts on Conflict Resolution — outside speakers on various aspects of World Conflict and strategy to meet conflict wherever it surfaces. Linked to efforts on campus concerning relations with International Students — how avoid conflict in the midst of cultural pluralism?

VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY
Sponsor: OSA
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19085
#Students: 9612 (coed)
Coordinator P/J: Ray Jackson, OSA

Revision of curriculum by having about thirty members of the faculty review their courses with an eye to developing peace and justice issues that fall naturally within the scope of the course. Monthly faculty meetings to share insights into peace and justice questions and to continue development of curricula to meet the needs in this area. Workshop in summer of 1977 for faculty of other Catholic colleges interested in this field.

WHEELING
Sponsor: S.J.
Wheeling, West Virginia
#Students: 600 (coed)
Coordinator P/J: John J. Conley, SJ

A two-pronged attack: (1) on the part of the Jesuit faculty an attempt to restate the meaning of their commitment to Catholic higher education at Wheeling College in West Virginia — printed statement of their understanding of an Apostolate in the Appalachian area. (2) A "junior year abroad" concept with Appalachia substituting for abroad. Open to students of other colleges and universities, this program offers on-site experience of injustices together with academic study and reflection in seminars that are a regular feature of the Appalachian Studies program.

AQUINAS
Sponsor: O.P.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506
#Students: 1400 (coed)
Coordinator P/J: Ann Thielen, OP

The core group of faculty, staff, administrators, and campus ministry personnel has engaged itself in a process of consciousness-raising on justice issues. Members of different departments are invited to present ways in which their discipline is open to a "justice thrust" and to dialogue with other faculty about inter-relatedness of programs. Summer workshops in 1977 focused on Peace and Justice and new courses have been added to the curriculum as a result of these activities.

HOLY NAMES
Sponsor: S.N.J.M.
Oakland, California 94619
#Students: 698 (coed)
Coordinator P/J: Ann Charlotte, SNJM

Coordination of many on-going efforts to serve the needs of a proportionately large number of students from other countries. Justice requires a review of curriculum, residence facilities, dining hall, co-curricular activities from the point of view of an attempt to create a truly "international" college community rather than one in which there is the "college" and the "foreign students." The faculty and administration at Holy Names are very sensitive to the special demands of their kind of student body and are

attempting to raise their own consciousness as well as that of the students themselves.

IONA
Sponsor: C.F.C.
New Rochelle, New York 10801
#Students: 4975 (coed)
Coordinator P/J: Patrick Sean Moffett, CFC

Focused on injustices within the college community. In addition to a number of sessions on issues of social jutice, the Committee set up for Justice Education has undertaken action in two areas: possible injustices to students and a better way of structuring the Academic Senate to respond to faculty concerns. A course in peace and justice issues under the title "Catholicism and the Challenges of Modern Culture;" a Campus Ministry effort to communicate concern for peace and justice efforts through linkage with campus liturgies in the 1978-79 year; and a Summer Institute in Peace and Justice Education for the Eastern Province of the Congregation of Christian brothers.

ACCU ANNUAL MEETING

Capital Hilton Hotel
Washington, D.C.

WORKSHOPS

Sunday, February 4, 1979
1:00 p.m.-2:15 p.m.

Exercising our Public Trust

I Resources for International Education in Catholic Colleges and Universities

II Trustees in Catholic Colleges and Universities: Authority or Illusion?

III Programs in Education for Justice

IV Confronting Career Education

Monday, February 5, 1979
9:00 a.m.-10:15 a.m.

Same — Repeated

EXTRA

Sunday, February 4, 1979
7:30 p.m.-9:30 p.m.
New York Room

Colleges and Sponsoring Religious Bodies

Designed for those who were unable to attend the full-day seminars sponsored by ACCU in November. A brief resume of the issues and opportunity for questions and discussion. Special additional fee $25.00 (includes copy of the document).